DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 109 091 SP 009 340

AUTHOR	Alpren, Morton; And Others
TITLE	The Reform of Secondary Education; A Professional Evaluation.
INSTITUTION	Temple Univ., Philadelphia, Pa. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE	75
NOTE	74p.
AVAILABLE FROM	College of Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122 ($2.00 plus mailing)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$3.32 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; Career Education; Curriculum; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Change; Educational History; *Educational Innovation; Educational Objectives; *Educational Trends; Instructional Media; *Secondary Education; Student Rights; Teacher Education; Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This report is a collection of articles by various authors, which examine issues surrounding the reform of secondary education. Part 1 presents a historical survey of American education. Part 2 develops a conceptual framework for making useful policy statements. It also considers issues of individual freedom and social order, with emphasis on legal, social, and economic problems. Part 3 deals with legal questions involving school law, the courts, and the contrasting ways student rights and teacher rights have been dealt with traditionally in the past and by present activist courts. Part 4 concentrates on political problems of secondary education reform. Part 5 offers a perspective of views on secondary education, and discusses the following areas related to teacher education and education generally: (a) alternativeness, (b) individualization and flexibility, (c) broadening the base, and (d) financial support. Part 6 provides a systematic examination of six questions concerning goals, curriculum, and reform. Part 7 focuses on adolescent development and several related issues for reform. Part 8 (a) provides a historical perspective on the development of education from individual instruction to classrooms and schools, (b) describes the emergence of new roles for teachers and schools, and (c) summarizes recent educational media research. Part 9 argues that career education is not an educational concept but a slogan that needs interpreting. Part 10 elicits recommendations from each article and offers suggestions for future action. (Author/JS)

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Temple University
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD
The Response Committee ii

INTRODUCTION
Carl A. Lefevre, Editor iii

1. HISTORICAL EVALUATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND REFORM
William W. Cutler III 1

2. THE REFORM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION: POLICY IMPLICATIONS
Bernard C. Watson 6

3. RIGHTS OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS AND REFORM
Herbert C. Hudgins, Jr. 10

4. UNRESOLVED POLITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE REFORM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION
B. Paul Komisar 21

5. THE REFORM OF SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION
Matthew H. Bruce 24

6. GOALS, CURRICULUM, AND REFORM
Morton Alpren 32

7. ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT: SOME IMPLICATIONS AND RELEVANT ISSUES FOR REFORM
Patricia Minuchin 39

8. INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA AND REFORM
William F. Grady 46

9. CAREER EDUCATION AND REFORM
Janice Morehouse 50

10. EFFECTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORM
Frank X. Sutman 55
Chairman of the Response Committee

© 1975 College of Education, Temple University

FOREWORD

Professional involvement in educational policy may include either of two basic functions, or both at once: (1) the direct development of policy, or (2) responses to policy recommendations of others. This volume of responses to **A Report of the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education** combines both these functions. The writing was undertaken at the suggestion of the late Dean Benjamin Rosner, arising out of his conviction that the Temple University College of Education should become more deeply involved in helping to develop national educational policies. Acting Dean Roy Kress, among his many other concerns, has staunchly supported the initiative taken by Dean Rosner. James Jones, Paul Komisar, and Frank Sutman formed the original committee and chose Frank Sutman to be chairman; eventually the committee was expanded to the twelve members whose names appear below in alphabetical order.

We offer the ideas and historical background in this book to the educational community with the hope that in some measure they will help to improve the overall quality of education for all children and young adults in American schools.

The Response Committee

Morton Alpren
Matthew H. Bruce
William W. Cutler, III
William F. Grady
Herbert C. Hudgins, Jr.
James Jones
B. Paul Komisar
Carl A. Lefevre
Patricia Minuchin
Janice Morehouse
Frank X. Sutman
Bernard C. Watson

INTRODUCTION

Carl A. Lefevre

Background and Purpose

The Reform of Secondary Education is the Report of the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, a 21-member Commission chaired by B. Frank Brown, established by the Charles F. Kettering Foundation's Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc. The Report is a nearly 200-page paperback book (McGraw-Hill, 1973) containing fourteen chapters dealing with thirty-two recommendations under six headings: 1. The Setting for Reform in Secondary Education; 2. New National Goals; 3. Revitalizing the Content of Secondary Education; 4. Alternatives to Traditional Secondary Education; 5. The Challenge: Crisis and Change in Secondary Education; and 6. Issues and Dissent.

In his Foreword, the chairman of the commission uses the subtitle, "A Stormy Petrel," to symbolize the history and development of secondary education in this country. He concludes with this statement:

> The Commission does not expect its recommendations for reform to command unanimous approval. It does hope they will evoke discussion, debate, controversy, and action. Nor does the Commission anticipate or think it desirable for its recommendations to bring peace and harmony to the nation's secondary schools. An institution which is designed to serve society by educating its adolescents can be expected to, and should, remain controversial. It should continue to live up to its reputation as a stormy petrel. (p. xv)

A University of Minnesota Ph.D. in English, Language, and Literature, Carl A. Lefevre is Professor of English Education in the Temple University College of Education.

This volume responds to the spirit of that statement. The reader will find the various chapters helpful in interpreting the recommendations of the Commission (reproduced as an addendum to this Introduction) or valuable simply as a self-contained document that looks critically at major issues confronting secondary education in the United States today. Throughout this volume, guidelines are proposed and discussed that should be followed in developing policy statements, especially those related to educational issues. They can be of significant professional value to everyone involved in the future development of educational policies.

The National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education developed in the wake of recent local, state, and national efforts at educational reform. According to the Commission, its charge was to:

> . . . make a comprehensive examination of secondary education (in the United States) and provide the American public with a clear factual picture of their secondary schools, indicating where and how they can be altered to better serve the nation's young people. (Foreword, p. xiv)

As a leading institution engaged in preservice and inservice education of teachers, the Temple University College of Education maintains a continuous interest in developing policies for the operation of our schools and in the preparation of teachers, administrators, and other professionals responsible for the effective functioning of the schools. Within a month after the publication of **The Reform of Secondary Education**, the late Dean Benjamin Rosner asked a study group of faculty members to consider the report in detail, because of our institutional obligation to the profession. This volume is a major effort

to fulfill the expressed hope of the Commission that the Report would "evoke discussions, debate, controversy, and action."

The writers of these chapters believe that educational progress can be achieved only through careful analytical responses to recommendations and discussions that may lead to important actions; these chapters deal with many but not all aspects of the Report. They focus attention on whether or not certain recommendations are viable and capable of implementation; several of the chapters point out serious contradictions among the recommendations. But a single professional concern expressed throughout overrides the significance of any one recommendation or group of recommendations; this overriding concern is that the Report fails to deal with crucial implications of some of its strongest recommendations. This concern will be more explicitly stated in the brief descriptions of all the chapters in the remainder of this Introduction, and more particularly in the chapters themselves.

Each of the ten chapters in this volume attempts to give useful background before it deals with general issues or specific recommendations. Several of the authors react to statements made by other authors within the group. Not all concerns relating to the improvement of secondary education are dealt with; for example, there is no specific chapter on the organization and administration of secondary schools, although tangential references to related matters occur in several chapters; also there is no chapter on the achievement of communication skills, but at least two authors refer to its importance. The Response Committee did list in order of priority many areas for deliberation, but limited its attention to those considered to be the top nine; these areas are indicated by the chapter titles in the Table of Contents. Chapter 10 is a critical overview of the Response Committee Chairman, with several recommendations for further action.

The discussions in this volume can serve as a basis for developing realistic, in-depth recommendations for the reform of secondary education. Some recommendations herein supplement or even replace those presented in the Report; others expand upon them by dealing in greater depth and/or specificity with particular issues. The Committee generally agrees with **The Report on the Reform of Secondary Education** that action is required if we are to develop secondary school experiences that can effectively prepare greater numbers of our young adults to play their chosen roles in society, and to shoulder the responsibilities entailed in enjoying the freedoms they are entitled to under our system of government. Several chapters indicate how appropriate actions can be taken to reach these objectives.

Organizational Plan of This Volume

The sequence of chapters in the Table of Contents is intended to provide a logical order of looking at the varied topics considered. In addition to the brief discussions below, the reader will find at the beginning of each chapter a Summary and Forecast to prepare him for the following discussion. If he examines all these introductory sections first, he can readily obtain an overview of the entire volume that will enable him to select which chapter he prefers to read first, or perhaps to determine his own sequence for reading them. The chapters dealing with **The Reform of Secondary Education** follow this order: *1. historical evaluation; 2. policy implications; 3. rights of students and teachers; 4. unresolved political*

issues; 5. secondary teacher education; 6. goals and curriculum; 7. adolescent development; 8. educational media; 9. career education; 10. effective recommendations for reform.

Chapter 1. Historical Evaluation of Secondary Education and Reform (William W. Cutler III). This chapter, which credits the Commission with a concern for both individual freedom and social order and focuses attention on "collective individualism" as a key attribute of American society, can serve doubly as an introduction to the chapters that follow. First, it presents a brief historical survey of American education to the present time. Second, against this background, and with specific references to points raised by four of the other authors, it deals critically with several of the Report recommendations and related issues that are either explicit or implicit in the Report.

Chapter 2. THE REFORM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION: Policy Implications (Bernard C. Watson). This chapter develops a clearly defined conceptual framework for making useful policy statements and then applies that framework critically and systematically to the Report as a whole (regarded as a series of recommendations, not policy statements), and to a number of recommendations that are found to be deficient (2, 9, 10, 21, 22, 28). It also considers issues of individual freedom and social order, with sharp emphasis on crucial legal, social, and economic problems. This chapter follows well after Chapter 1 and helps prepare the reader for Chapter 3.

Chapter 3. Rights of Students and Teachers and Reform (Herbert C. Hudgins Jr.). This chapter deals critically and thoroughly with legal questions involving school law, the courts, and the quite contrasting ways student rights and teacher rights have been dealt with traditionally in the past and by activist courts, more recently, with copious citations throughout of relevant legal suits and judgments. Noting that the Report deals much more fully with student rights than teacher rights, the author finds it seriously deficient in its treatment of complex legal problems, largely because of the mass of court decisions it ignores.

Chapter 4. Unresolved Political Problems of THE REFORM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION (B. Paul Komisar). This chapter, although sharply critical of the Report for the way it handles its recommended shift of school control away from a school-dominated custodial system ("paternalism") toward a more public-dominated system ("participation"), nevertheless commends it for advocating, however ineptly, a new political basis for school control.

Chapter 5. The Reform of Secondary TEACHER Education. (Matthew H. Bruce). This chapter reflects many concerns of previous chapters and raises new concerns of its own, in a comprehensive, systematic effort to answer the question: "Can secondary teacher education survive a major reorganization of the nation's secondary schools?" The author finds very serious contradictions, both financial and philosophical, in the Report. He offers a perspective of views on secondary education, including the Commission's, followed by a discussion of four areas related to secondary teacher education and education generally, and a number of the Report recommendations. These areas are: (1) Alternativeness; (2) Individualization and Flexibility; (3) Broadening the Base; and (4) Financial Support. The chapter ends with an affirmative answer (with reservations) to the question it began with, and suggests in some detail four possibilities for effective action.

Chapter 6. Goals, Curriculum, and Reform. (Morton Alpren). This chapter argues persuasively that the Report deals with the goals and the curriculum of the secondary schools, but without establishing any clear connection between the two. The author's method is a systematic examination of a series of six interrelated questions, offering some conclusions about them. He commends the Report for raising curricular issues which should stimulate debate, but faults it for not providing an adequate and disciplined rationale—particularly not for the basic issue of commonality versus diversity, which he views as parallel with society (or the common good) versus the individual.

Chapter 7. Adolescent Development: Some Implications and Relevant Issues for Reform. (Patricia Minuchin). In two main sections, this chapter discusses adolescent development quite comprehensively as it relates to both the general implications of the Report and numerous specific recommendations (1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 20, 23, 27, 28, 30) which the author considers in clusters under appropriate subheadings within the second section. Here, as in Chapter 6, the point is made of the contradiction in the Report between commonality and diversity, with the acknowledgment, however, that there is no obvious way to solve this problem.

Chapter 8. Instructional Media and Reform. (William F. Grady). This chapter deals critically with Chapter 8 within Part IV of the Report: "The Impact of Television and Curriculum Content." While the author commends the Report in general, he finds a major weakness in its failure to recognize the potentialities for reform that could be provided by educational media other than television. The author provides an historical perspective on the development of education from individual instruction to classrooms and schools, with their rigid schedules of time, space, and age levels; describes the emergence of different roles for teachers and schools; and briefly summarizes recent educational media research, and makes recommendations for further research tending toward greater utilization of all the resources of educational media.

Chapter 9. Career Education and Reform. (Janice Morehouse). This chapter argues that career education is not an educational concept to be defined but a slogan that needs interpreting; and also that it serves the interests of politics and business rather than education. The author notes contradictions between the proposal on career education and the rest of the Report. The main body of the chapter discusses career education under three headings: The Elusive Definition; The Commission's Proposal; and Critique, with two subheadings: (1) Obsolescence, and (2) Naïve, Unrealistic Beliefs.

Chapter 10. Effective Recommendations for Reform. (Frank X. Sutman, Chairman of the Response Committee). This chapter presents an overview of **The Reform of Secondary Education** and this volume of responses from the vantage point of the person responsible for seeing the project through to its conclusion. While other authors in this volume have deplored the shallowness, naiveté, unrealism, and the many contradictions in the Report, this author raises new and deeper issues for further debate, discussion, and action, hoping to avoid premature and precipitate reform action.

Addenda

In order to provide the reader of these chapters with adequate materials to develop his own perspectives, two addenda to this Introduction are presented here: (1) 32 recommendations for improving

secondary education (from Chapter 2 of the Report); and (2) national goals in historical perspective (Appendix B of the Report).

Recommendations for Improving Secondary Education*

1. Defining Secondary School Expectations

Every secondary school and its subordinate departments must formulate a statement of goals and develop performance criteria for students. Goals and objectives should be published in information bulletins for students and parents and be posted in a conspicuous place within the school building.

2. Community Participation in Determining Secondary School Expectations

Schools will not be able to achieve their purposes without increased help from the people in the communities they serve. Communities must participate in the formulation of goals and continuing efforts to refine and adapt the statements of goals and objectives. The communities as a whole, not solely the subsection called schools, must achieve the goals.

3. The Basis for Curricular Revision

The high schools should no longer be required to perform purely custodial functions. Attempts to keep in school adolescents who do not wish to be there damage the environment for learning. The content of traditional high school curricula should be revised to eliminate busy-work components designed merely to occupy the time of adolescents who are in school only because the law requires it. Revitalization of the curriculum will require attention to the earlier maturation of adolescents. Intelligent evaluation of curricular revision must grow from valid measurements of the degree to which students are achieving the stated goals and objectives of their school.

4. Teacher Training

Teacher training institutions should revise their programs so that prospective teachers are exposed to the variety of teaching and learning options in secondary education. New teachers should be able to work in several instructional modes.

Extensive in-service programs should be instituted to retrain teachers presently employed to equip them with a greater variety of approaches and skills. This need will become increasingly acute as the decline in birth rate encumbers the schools with aging teaching staffs.

5. Bias in Textbooks

State legislatures must ensure that procedures are established so that textbooks and materials used in the schools do not present inaccurate accounts of the contributions of various ethnic groups or inaccurate portrayals of the role of women.

6. Bias in Counseling

Counselors should ensure that all students, regardless of sex or ethnic background, are afforded equal latitude and equally positive guidance in making educational choices.

7. Affirmative Action

Every high school should establish an affirmative action committee composed of students, former students, faculty, and community representatives. The purpose of this committee is to examine and report to the administration on instances of inequality and discrimination involving students or groups of students at the school.

---

*From **The Reform of Secondary Education** by B. Frank Brown, editor. Copyright © 1973 McGraw Hill Book Company. Used with permission of McGraw Hill Book Company.

8. Expanding Career Opportunities

Secondary schools must realign their curricula to provide students with a range of experiences and activities broad enough to permit them to take full advantage of career opportunities in their communities. To meet this objective, basic components of the school program will have to be offered in the late afternoon or in the evening for some students.

9. Career Education

Career education advisory councils including representatives of labor, business, community, students, and former students should be established to assist in planning and implementing career education programs in comprehensive high schools.

Career awareness programs should be initiated as an integral part of the curriculum to assure an appreciation of the dignity of work.

Opportunities for exploration in a variety of career clusters should be available to students in grades 8 through 10.

In grades 11 and 12, students should have opportunities to acquire hard skills in a career area of their choice. This training should involve experience in the world outside and should equip the student with job-entry skills.

10. Job Placement

Suitable job placement must be an integral part of the career education program for students planning to enter the labor force upon leaving school. Secondary schools should establish an employment office staffed by career counselors and clerical assistants. The office should work in close cooperation with the state employment services. Agencies certifying counselors for secondary schools should require such counselors to show experience in job placement as a condition for granting initial certification.

11. Global Education

The education of the nation's adolescents must be superior to that of their parents. Part of this superiority must be an enhanced sense of the globe as the human environment, and instruction to this end must reflect not only the ancient characteristics of the world, but emerging knowledge of biological and social unity. All secondary school students should receive a basic global education.

New instructional material for global education must be prepared if this recommendation is to be effective. State departments of education should require teacher training institutions to design programs which prepare teachers to present such programs.

12. Alternative Paths to High School Completion

A wide variety of paths leading to completion of requirements for graduation from high school should be made available to all students. Individual students must be encouraged to assume major responsibility for the determination of their educational goals, the development of the learning activities needed to achieve those goals, and the appraisal of their progress.

13. Local Board Responsibilities for Funding Alternatives.

Whenever a student chooses an acceptable alternative to the comprehensive high school, the local school boards should fund his education at the level of current expenditure computed for other students.

14. Credit for Experience

Secondary schools should establish extensive programs to award academic credit for accomplishment outside the building, and for learning that occurs on the job, whether the job be undertaken for pay, for love, or for its own sake. Community involvement will, of course, be required

in such a program and should be as encompassing as possible.

15. Secondary Level Examination Program

The College Level Examination Board should expand its College Level Examination Program to include a comparable Secondary Level Examination Program. The tests should be routinely administered quarterly or monthly to help adolescents to obtain credit for work done outside the classroom.

16. Broadcast Television

Major funding sources, including both foundations and the National Institute of Education, should initiate and support extensive research into the influence of television on students' attitudes, perceptions, and life styles. The purpose of this research should be to suggest changes in school curricula and instructional approach.

The broadcasting industry should establish media fellowships designed to afford secondary school teachers and instructional leaders the opportunity to study the use of broadcast commercial television for educational purposes.

17. Classroom Use of Broadcast Material

Copyright laws and union contracts should be written to make sure that classroom use of broadcast materials copied off the air is not unnecessarily restricted. Television programs should never be asked to carry instructional burdens alone. Books and pamphlets must be specially and carefully prepared to accompany all instruction via television. Both the instructional television program and the printed materials should be available in public libraries as well as in schools.

18. Cable Television

When cable franchises are awarded, the local school system should have exclusive use of three channels during the daytime, with possible use of more as needed. At least one—and preferably all three—of these cable channels should continue to be available for nighttime viewing by school students or for purposes of adult education.

19. Flexibility of Alternative Programs.

Differing time sequences—hourly, daily, weekly, yearly—must be made available so that educational programs can be adapted to the needs of individual students.

Schools are already moving away from the Carnegie Unit and are beginning to grant credit on the basis of competence, demonstrated experience, and a host of other assessments. It is recommended that this practice be expanded and that the Carnegie Unit become merely one of the alternative ways of granting credit.

20. Rank in Class

Articulation between secondary schools and post-secondary schools must be improved with each level seeking to support the educational efforts of the other. Personnel representing both levels must cooperatively develop alternatives to gradepoint average and rank in class for assessing the scope and quality of the education received by students at the secondary level. High Schools should stop calculating student rank in class for any purpose.

21. Planning for School Security

All secondary school systems should develop security plans to safeguard students, faculty, equipment, and facilities. Specific procedures must be developed for faculty members to follow in case of disruption.

22. Records of Violence

State legislation should be enacted to require principals to file a detailed report on all serious assaults within schools. The information contained should form a data base from which security personnel could identify potential trouble areas and move to alleviate future problems.

23. Code of Student Rights and Obligations

Every secondary school should develop and adopt a code of student rights and obligations. This code should be published and distributed to every student. It should include all school rules, regulations, and procedures for suspension and expulsion with explanations of how students can defend themselves through established process.

24. School Newspapers

A school newspaper is a house organ which is operated, financed, and therefore controlled by the school system, which may be legally liable for its contents. In cases where students and school administrators become deadlocked over censorship, a student-faculty-community committee should decide the issue. Some schools may find it necessary to withdraw financial support, allowing students complete freedom of expression in what would then be entirely their own publication, with a corresponding liability for what is printed.

25. Right of Privacy

A student's school records must contain only factual information necessary to the educative process. The entire file must be available at all times for review by students and their parents but must not be accessible to "persons not in interest." Records should be forwarded to another school system, university, or prospective employer only at the written request of the student, his parents, or the receiving school.

That part of a student's records which pertain to his mental health should contain only entries made under the direction of the student's physician and must be kept separately from his academic records. The complete record or any of its contents should be released only to the student, his parents, or to his physician at the student's or parent's request.

26. Corporal Punishment

Several states have outlawed corporal punishment with no resulting loss in control or authority. Corporal punishment should be abolished by statute in all states. In the modern world, corporal punishment is necessarily "cruel and unusual."

27. Student Activities

Scholarship should not be a requisite for participation in sports, band, singing, cheerleading, or other student activities important to the social development of adolescents. Neither the local school nor state activities associations should establish scholarship standards. Any student in good standing in a school should have the right to participate in any of the school's activities with the exception of honor societies specifically established to reward scholarship.

28. Compulsory Attendance

If the high school is not to be a custodial institution, the state must not force adolescents to attend. Earlier maturity—physical, sexual, and intellectual—requires an option of earlier departure from the restraints of formal schooling.

The formal school-leaving age should be dropped to age fourteen. Other programs should accommodate those who wish to leave school, and employment laws should be rewritten to assure on-the-job training in full-time service and work.

29. Free K-14 Public Education

The Congress of the United States in conjunction with state legislatures should enact legislation that will entitle each citizen to fourteen years of tuition-free education beyond kindergarten, only eight of which would be compulsory. The remaining six years should be available for use by anyone at any stage of his life. Congressional involvement is essential to assure equal access in an age of interstate mobility.

30. Youth Organizations

The National Association of Secondary School Principals, a professional organization for school administrators, currently operates two of the largest organizations affecting public high school youth: the National Student Council Association and the National Honor Society. The principals' group should dissociate itself from these organizations and help them become independent national youth organizations.

31. Sexism

School administrators and school boards, at both the state and local levels, must set forth commitments to eliminate all vestiges of sexism in the schools.

Areas of immediate concern are equal employment and treatment of the sexes in instructional and administrative positions, equal opportunities for female students to participate in all curricula areas, including career education, and the elimination of all courses required of only one sex.

Individual teachers should make sure they are not focusing their teaching toward either sex.

All female students who become pregnant should be permitted to remain in school for the full term of pregnancy if they wish to do so and their physician considers it feasible. They should be permitted to return to school following childbirth as soon as released by their physicians. There must be no denial of the right to participate in activities because of pregnancy or motherhood, whether the girl is wed or unwed.

32. Females in Competitive Team Sports

School boards administrators at the local level must provide opportunities for female students to participate in programs of competitive team sports that are comparable to the opportunities for males. The programs must be adequately funded through regular school budgets.

Outstanding female athletes must not be excluded from competition as members of male teams in noncontact sports. The fact that a school offers the same team sport for girls should not foreclose this option.

State activities associations should be required by statute to eliminate from their constitutions and bylaws all constraints to full participation in competitive team sports by females.

If state activities associations are to continue to have jurisdiction over female sports, they should be required by state statute to have equal sex representation on all boards supervising boys' and girls' athletics.

Appendix B National Goals in Historical Perspective*

CARDINAL PRINCIPLES OF 1918	NATIONAL GOALS OF 1973
Health (Physical Fitness)	Adjustment to Change (Mental Health)
Command of Fundamental Processes	Communication Skills Computation Skills
Vocation	Occupational Competence
Civic Education	Responsibility for Citizenship Respect for Law and Authority Appreciation of Others
Worthy Home Membership Worthy Use of Leisure Ethical Character	Knowledge of Self Critical Thinking Clarification of Values Economic Understanding The Achievements of Man Nature and Environment

- - - - - (Broken Line)/Separates interrelated goals
——— (Solid Line)/Separates unrelated goals

*From **The Reform of Secondary Education** by B. Frank Brown, editor. Copyright © 1973 McGraw Hill Book Company. Used with permission of McGraw Hill Book Company.*

HISTORICAL EVALUATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION AND REFORM

William W. Cutler III

Summary and Forecast

Clearly, the Kettering Report raises some significant questions about American education in general and about secondary education in particular. By calling for a balance between freedom and order, the Report departs from the social and corporate emphasis struck by the American high school in the 20th century. This search for a middle ground taps one of the central conflicts in American history. "Collective individualism" is what historian Michael Kammen has called it in his Pulitzer Prize winning book, **People of Paradox**; "What dualism in the American experience," Kammen has asked, "is more central to an understanding of our nature?"[1] No society, of course, can afford to ignore the inevitable problem of individual versus group interests. But in pluralistic America, this fundamental social issue has assumed perhaps greater importance than in more homogeneous nations. Historically, American secondary schools have not avoided confronting this dualism, but today when more Americans than ever before seem more at home with their diversity, the old corporate response of the high school is no longer acceptable.[2] Some, like my colleague Morton Alpren, in Chapter 6, would argue that this national Report does not, indeed cannot, supply a blueprint for achieving a balance in American education between individual rights and social needs. But no matter how you evaluate the Report, it is undeniable today that the Commission's search for such an equilibrium—however flexible this balance may have to be in practice—is altogether appropriate.

The main body of this discussion deals with two topics, one general, the other more specific: (A) *American Secondary Education—the Historical Background* is a brief historical survey; (B) *The Recommendations of the Report* comments on the recommendations in relation to the historical background and current issues.

American Secondary Education—The Historical Background

In nineteenth-century America secondary schooling was primarily for the elite. An elementary education was believed to be sufficient preparation for life, and proposals for the public support of secondary schools often encountered sharp opposition. The working class saw no advantage for their children in the coming of public high schools, and taxpayers in general objected to their cost.[3] The famous Kalamazoo decision of 1874 opened the way for public support of secondary education, but it was not until the 1920s that the public high school really began to become a mass institution. Even then, however, not all American youth expected to go to high school, and the dropout rate was enormous. More than half of all public high school freshmen in 1920 left before completing their senior year.[4]

The city was an important influence on the growth of secondary education in the United States. Before the Civil War public high schools opened mostly in urban areas where there were enough well-established families to warrant their existence. In 1860 the residents of America's cities had forty public high schools at their disposal, and that number multiplied tenfold over the next quarter century.

A Cornell University Ph.D., William W. Cutler III is Assistant Professor of History and Foundations of Education at Temple University.

Still, 400 public high schools for more than 18,000,000 urban dwellers was hardly adequate; clearly, few if any Americans in the late 1880s thought that secondary education should be universal.[5]

Compulsory school laws which first appeared in the 1850s in Massachusetts and New York had little effect on secondary education until long after 1900. On the books in all forty-eight states by 1918, such laws varied greatly from one state to another but generally shared a common target in the poor child of elementary school age. Only after 1920 when it came to be assumed that the demands of daily living required a secondary education did the practice of compulsory attendance affect the American high school. By then the secondary curriculum was also in transition as the Seven Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education, advanced by the National Education Association in 1918, recognized and encouraged the trend already underway to make the high school more functional and less college oriented. In twenty-five years the NEA had turned around from the position of its Committee of Ten which in 1893 had defined the secondary curriculum in strictly academic terms. The four equivalent tracks proposed by the Committee included varying but heavy amounts of mathematics and such newly respectable high school subjects as modern foreign languages and the natural sciences. Commercial and industrial courses which began in the 1880s increased rapidly after 1900, and by the 1920s even the academic major was being pushed toward greater social and economic utility. Traditionalists in such fields as English, history, science, and mathematics found themselves resisting substantial pressure to make these subjects the servants of popular culture and a more efficient society.[6]

Here the high school was sustaining a larger ideal. Before World War I, Progressive leaders like Herbert Croly and Theodore Roosevelt spoke for the corporate state in which each citizen achieved distinction by contributing to the national good. Individual freedom and autonomy were secondary to collective purposes, and beginning in the 1910s, educational leaders like David Snedden, a sociologist at Teachers College, and Colin Scott, the champion of the social education movement, attracted wide attention as advocates of the public schools becoming the backbone of the corporate state. The Seven Cardinal Principles emerged from this line of thought, although Snedden himself disapproved of them on the grounds that they were not sufficiently supportive of utility and specialization. But the differentiation of courses and students was clearly underway, and the sorting of pupils by class, race, and national culture was not at all uncommon. In fact, IQ tests, first widely used in the 1920s, supplied an apparently scientific rationale for such differentiation in preparation for useful service to the corporate state.[7] But the separation of students was not without drawbacks, and the idea of the comprehensive high school appeared at the same time both to facilitate specialization and to overcome its undemocratic effects. The comprehensive high school taught unity through the use by all of one common facility and through the togetherness of the extra-curriculum.[8]

The Great Depression did not change the direction of American secondary education. During the 1930s many of the accepted American values and practices did sustain heavy criticism. But as Edward Krug has shown, the financial constraints of the Depression along with a new American sympathy for collective action maintained, indeed strengthened, the high schools' commitment to "the efficiency aim."[9]

After the Second World War the American secondary school continued to stress unity and utility as important

social and economic goals. Seemingly able to adapt to any economic or cultural conditions, corporate educators like Charles A. Prossner, a pioneer spokesman for industrial training in the 20th century, in the prosperous but shell-shocked forties called for life adjustment education. Perhaps more than ever before, public and parochial high schools were encouraged to prepare young Americans for life in the corporate state as well-balanced workers and consumers. Much to the consternation of a few vocal academics like Arthur Bestor, courses entitled "Home and Family Living" became prominent fare in the secondary curriculum.[10] Bestor would have his day, however, after the launching of Sputnik in 1957; with James Bryant Conant leading the way, American secondary schools swung back toward a more academic program with special provisions for the gifted student. And yet this was not an abandonment of the corporate movement's fundamental commitment to education for utility and the national good. The individual still was subordinate to the demands of the whole, but now in the middle of the Cold War, national defense, not social democracy, was the rallying cry. Far from forgotten, the spirit of the Seven Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education was very much alive.

The Recommendations of the Commission's Report

The Report represents a meaningful step away from the corporate tradition in American secondary education. Touted as the first thorough evaluation of the American high school since 1918, the Report attempts to strike a balance between the rights and needs of the individual on the one hand and those of society on the other. The purpose of secondary education, says the Report, should be to provide "experiences that enable people of great diversity to live together in harmony while maintaining their individuality."[11]

The recommendations of the Report cover a wide range of concerns, but they generally recognize the importance of both individual freedom and social order. The Report, for example, strongly approves of career education but criticizes the United States Office of Education for advocating that "all educational experiences . . . be geared to preparation for making a living." A chapter on school rules and regulations discusses both student rights and obligations.[12] As H. C. Hudgins shows in Chapter 3 of this response, the courts in recent years have cautiously examined and partially clarified the status of student and teacher rights in American elementary and secondary schools. In the Report, too, more emphasis is placed on student rights than duties, a position which is consistent with the general perspective of the Commission. As if in reaction to the social and collective orientation of American secondary education in the past, the Report calls for more student autonomy and independence. Sexism is attacked as an unfair limitation on the freedom of female students while a similar charge is directed at ethnic and racial bias in high school textbooks and counseling.[13]

The suggestion that the compulsory attendance age be reduced to fourteen is undoubtedly the Report's most controversial proposal. To do away with "the near-monopoly of secondary education" by the comprehensive high school, the Report favors "the provision of basically different means, perhaps even different ends, for the individual student."[14] It speaks positively of the role of independent and church-related secondary schools in American society and even argues for the formal recognition of experience, both occupational and social, as one means

to accredited education; whether supervised by educational authorities or not, learning which takes place outside the school must be recognized and credited. The Report also stresses the importance of the student's role in his own education. Students, it says, "must be encouraged to assume major responsibility for the determination of their educational goals, the development of the learning activities needed to achieve those goals, and the appraisal of their progress."[15]

According to Patricia Minuchin in Chapter 7 there are many dangers in allowing adolescents to make too many important and perhaps irrevocable decisions too early in life. But the Report does not leave student (and/or parent) freedom of choice totally unlimited or unqualified. Despite their approval of non-public schools, the authors of the Report could not bring themselves to sanction public aid for such institutions. Moreover, while individual students ought to have more control over when and what they learn, "they should still be required," according to the Report, "to acquire competencies for adult living."[16] How to make certain that such competencies will be acquired outside the framework of the school is left largely to the reader's imagination. Moreover, it is not enough to guarantee six years of free formal education beyond the eighth grade as the Report recommends. What if some choose never to take advantage of this opportunity and never even satisfactorily learn to read? Those most likely to leave school at the earliest possible time are those least well-prepared to cope with modern society. Poor or black Americans whose families need money to survive and whose culture often conflicts with that of the school surely would be the first to make extensive use of a reduced school leaving age. The Report does not adequately show how in the long run such children could be helped in any way to make the most of their lives. This is not to say that the compulsory attendance age must be maintained at sixteen but only that as Bernard Watson points out in Chapter 2, a more carefully articulated plan of alternatives and inducements than that contained in the Report is needed to transform its promise of continuing education into a meaningful quality.

The Report's commitment to competency-based instruction is consistent with a larger trend in American education today. Indeed, like the scientific management movement of the 1920s, the recent trend toward performance-based education may well be a defensive response to the flood of criticism which has swept over the public schools in our own time as well as in the earlier years of this century. When pressured to defend themselves and protect the vast sums annually spent on public education, American schools in the 20th century have twice retreated to the relatively safe ground of objective results measurable by some tangible means. Fifty years ago cost accounting, efficiency rating systems, and school surveys produced the hard evidence which educators hoped would persuade the public of their sincerity and expertise.[17] Although more a curricular than an administrative response to criticism, performance-based instruction today promises to show in a quantitative and hence apparently convincing way what the schools are worth. But as pointed out by one dissenting member of the reporting team, John A. Stanavage, competency-based education has certain limitations, not the least of which may be a tendency toward narrowness and rigidity.[18] On the other hand, by their dual stress on essential skills and alternate means to the high school the authors of the Report left themselves little choice but to advocate performance-based secondary education. How except in

terms of competencies can the learning value of life experience be meaningfully evaluated?

Of course, by proposing to measure and give high school credit for the skills or knowledge acquired through experience, the Report ends by not being nearly as iconoclastic as it might at first appear. Who, for example, will write and administer the specific competency examinations which are only generally recommended? The leaders and organizations of the Educational Establishment now in command would be the logical choice. In fact, such competency tests would undoubtedly work doubly to the advantage of the Establishment by maintaining its existing power while reducing its duties and obligations. Educationists still would control access to certification but with far less responsibility for the fate of those aspiring to it; the school could not be praised or blamed for the success or failure of those trained by experience. But perhaps such a diffusion of duty would not be an unqualified evil. Just as the school has carried too much of the burden for the resolution of America's problems since the mid 19th century so, too, has it borne too much of the blame when problems were not solved. As we are now becoming more and more aware, the public school cannot solve all our problems, and to diminish its responsibility for basic training may well be one of the most effective ways to make this important point.

The recent court decisions in California, Texas, and New Jersey which have called into question the current property tax laws for public education are relevant here also. If, as this litigation seems to suggest, states are required to provide equal education for all their eligible citizens, government may have to expand its involvement in education far beyond the public schools. So much learning takes place in the home and on the street that the states may now be facing the prospect of financial support to equalize the educational content of these non-school settings.[19] Giving credit for experience, as the Report recommends, is a modest move in this direction. By advocating what it calls "alternate paths to high school completion," the Commission has at least partially spoken (whether knowingly or not) to what looms as a critical issue in the future of American education.

REFERENCES

1. Michael Kammen, **People of Paradox: An Inquiry Concerning the Origins of American Civilization** (New York: Random House, 1973), 269.
2. Nathan Glazer, "Who do we think we are?" **Harvard Magazine** 76 (March, 1974), 26-32.
3. Michael B. Katz, **The Irony of Early School Reform: Educational Innovation in Mid Nineteenth Century Massachusetts** (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1968), 95.
4. Edward A. Krug, **The Shaping of the American High School. Volume 2 1920-1941** (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1972), 107-108.
5. Blake McKelvey, **The Urbanization of America,** 1860-1915 (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1963), 170; Katz, **Irony of Early School Reform,** 258-259; **Compendium of the Eleventh Census of the United States: 1890. Part I Population** (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1892), lxxi.
6. Krug, **Shaping of the American High School** 1920-1941, 68-106; McKelvey, **Urbanization of America,** 1860-1915, 174-175.

7. Edward A. Krug, **The Shaping of the American High School**, (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), 395-396; Clarence J. Karier, "Testing for Order and Control in the Corporate Liberal State," **Educational Theory** 22 (Spring, 1972), 159-180.
8. Joel Spring, **Education and the Rise of the Corporate State** (Boston: Beacon Press, 1972), 108-125.
9. Krug, **Shaping of the American High School**, 1920-1941, 208.
10. Richard Hofstadter, **Anti-Intellectualism in American Life** (New York Rand House, 1962), 345-358.
11. The National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education, **The Reform of Secondary Education** (New York: McGraw Hill, 1973), 26.
12. Ibid., 53 & 127-145.
13. Ibid., 146-161 & 46-47.
14. Ibid., 73-74 & 99.
15. Ibid., 16-17, 73-74, 84-96, & 99-100.
16. Ibid., 100 & 135.
17. Raymond E. Callahan, **Education and the Cult of Efficiency** (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).
18. The Report, p. 171.
19. I am indebted for some of these ideas to my colleagues at Temple University, Leonard Waks and Rosalie Cohen.

THE REFORM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION: POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Bernard C. Watson

Summary and Forecast

As simple recommendations from a study group, the Report of the National Commission on the Reform of Secondary Education has taken a step in the right direction. The Report addresses some of the deficiencies and shortcomings of secondary education in the U.S. at this period of our history. As recommendations for public policy, it has many deficiencies. If we are to move from noble pronouncements, however well intentioned, to effective implementation of agreed-upon goals a well planned effort must be launched to deal with the realities as well as the promise of secondary education in the U.S. The accomplishment of the goals and objectives of the Commission is dependent in large part on rational, well-developed public policy. The process whereby those public policies are developed should be the next item on the agenda. The substance of the resulting public policies will depend, in large measure, upon how adequately we deal with the policy implications of the recommendations of the Commission. Let us consider how we may effectively deal with these matters.

Policies governing educational effort may be usefully classified on two levels.[1] One concerns overriding national commitments or goals: universal education; equal educational opportunity; excellence in education; improvement in the quality of educational personnel; racial and social class integration; and like

A University of Chicago Ph.D., Bernard C. Watson is Professor of Foundations and Professor and Chairman of the Department of Urban Education at Temple University.

matters. The second level concerns actions taken to achieve these broad goals—the major subject of this analysis.

For our purpose here such policies may appropriately be labeled "policies of effective means;" that is, policies formulated to insure that the larger goals are achieved with the highest degree of effectiveness and with the greatest efficiency in the use of resources. In the absence of well-developed policy statements for action, even the most praiseworthy goal statements are likely to remain just that: noble goals without substance; goals that can never be achieved.

The remainder of this discussion is focused on two sequential topics: (A) *Characteristics of Useful Policy Statements*, which provides a conceptual framework for analyzing policies; and (B) *Policy Implications of Several Key Recommendations*, which applies conceptual framework to particular recommendations.

Characteristics of Useful Policy Statements

An appropriate question to be addressed is: What are the elements of a useful policy statement? It should include, at a minimum, the following five: (1) *Objectives*, (2) *Strategies*, (3) *Priorities*, (4) *Evaluation*, (5) *Diversity*.

(1) *Objectives*. These should include the character of the need or problem which brought the program or recommendation into being. Equally important, the nature and extent of the accomplishments being sought should be described in specific and concrete terms.

(2) *Strategies*. Once objectives are established, there is the important task of working out the means by which the objectives are to be realized. A good policy statement would reveal what the strategies are and provide the rationale which led to their adoption. The rationale should make it evident why the recommended means are considered most efficient and effective.

(3) *Priorities*. This area should be self-evident: Which broad problems are to be attacked first, and once this is decided, what kinds of approaches will be given priority consideration in funding and other kinds of support? In either case, a policy statement should spell out the range of options considered and reveal the criteria and rationale used in selecting those accorded priority.

(4) *Evaluation*. Although it is usually difficult to establish evaluation policies before a program is operational, confronting the question of evaluation at the outset will introduce a useful discipline into the development of objectives, strategies, and priorities. To be included, at the very minimum, should be the purposes, the criteria by which programs and projects are to be judged, the types of evaluation, the time in the life of the project or program at which evaluation is to be undertaken, and the nature of the data to be gathered.

(5) *Diversity*. Simply stated, this means that serious consideration of and respect for the philosophical or ideological bases of various approaches to implementation of goals must be a fundamental concern of those responsible for implementation.[2]

If one accepts the foregoing as a minimum conceptual framework for the analysis of policy considerations, it is now possible to examine several of the recommendations of the Report in terms of their adequacy. It should be noted at the outset, however, that the Report is essentially a series of recommendations, not a series of policy statements. It is reasonable and prudent, despite this caveat, to view them in terms of their *policy implications*.

Policy Implications of Several Key Recommendations

An analysis of the policy implications of several recommendations should demonstrate the necessity for clearly delineated policy statements. Recommendation 2 is a useful place to begin. The substance of this recommendation is that communities must be involved in an ongoing process of establishing goals, objectives, and purposes of education.[3] This is a noble statement, but what does it mean? If one applies the five elements of a good policy statement to this recommendation it is found to be deficient. Under *objectives* one finds no statement of the nature and extent of the accomplishments being sought. No *strategies* are established for achieving the objectives, and obviously there is no *rationale* which makes it evident why strategies chosen are efficient or effective. Would one choose community control? Shall involvement be at the school level or the central or both? No statement of *priorities* is provided. Should a community attack broad problems at the system level first: finance, staffing, specialized programs? Or should the priorities be focused on one area; for example early childhood education or career education?

Who is to evaluate progress on this recommendation? How is it to be done? There is no discussion of the criteria by which one can measure progress toward the accomplishment of this goal. Moreover, the opportunity to introduce a useful discipline in the establishment of clear objectives, strategies and priorities is lost because substantive evaluation questions are not confronted at the outset. The question of time involved in accomplishing the objectives is ignored entirely. Finally, there is no mention of the need for healthy *diversity*. In the various communities, the philosophical and ideological bases of various approaches to implementation of goals are of critical concern. These differences may lead one community to choose a decentralized educational system with strong elements of community control. In another community the choice may be an enlarged central board of education with a more representative membership. Another community may incorporate both and several other options similar to those proposed by the Greenfield Commission in Philadelphia.[4]

Before leaving recommendation 2, however, it seems important to comment on another policy issue of overriding importance. Recommendation 2 specifically states that communities as a whole, not solely the schools, must achieve the goals. It is the definition of the various responsibilities—community versus schools—which causes much misunderstanding and confusion. What are the school's responsibilities? What may parents and other citizens reasonably expect from the professionals employed to impart certain skills and understandings? In the establishment of goals and objectives, it is imperative that questions of this nature be confronted at the outset. A useful policy statement would clearly delineate the responsibilities and the accountability of the schools as well as the community.

Recommendation 28 also lends itself to the same kind of analysis.[5] If we apply the five elements of a good policy statement to this recommendation, it too, is found to be deficient. This recommendation urges that the formal school-leaving age should be dropped to age fourteen and that other programs should accommodate those who wish to leave school. At this point, however, the specificity ends. There are no mandated or well thought-out suggestions for insuring that those who leave school at fourteen will be guaranteed alternative programs of continuing education. There is no

statement discussing the protection of students who do not wish to leave school at age fourteen. Considerable evidence suggests that children and youth are sometimes forced out of school against their will and for capricious reasons. Especially in high density multi-racial urban areas and in newly desegregated school systems, ample evidence supports the fact that poor and minority youngsters predominate among the group leaving school prior to graduation.[6]

This recommendation is complicated by other facts. Most youth are unemployable in meaningful jobs at age fourteen. The continuing controversy over the minimum wage continues to divide labor and management. Youth unemployment consistently exceeds by many times the percentage of unemployed in the general population.[7] In this recommendation, as in others, there is no discussion of priorities, strategies or evaluation. Diversity is implied but only in the most perfunctory way by stating that employment laws should be rewritten to assure the job trainees full-time service and work. Since there are many similar weaknesses in other recommendations, one could continue to analyze the specific recommendations and point out their deficiencies as statements of recommended public policy. Such an exercise has limited benefits; many of the recommendations overlap and, in some instances, may be viewed as contradictory. A few examples may illustrate this point.

Recommendation 9 is closely related to recommendation 10. These two recommendations deal with job placement and the opportunity for students to acquire hard skills in a career area of their choice and the training leading to such skills should equip students with job entry skills.[8] The reality is that some craft and other unions will not accept certain students. The history of union discrimination against certain groups is too well known to document here. Given this situation, will governmental agencies —local, state and federal— intervene with public policy to ameliorate such problems and difficulties? In 1975, the prognosis is not particularly good.

Recommendations 21 and 22 are particularly deficient; moreover, they are fraught with peril.[9] The Report states that many schools refuse to cooperate with law enforcement personnel who wish to interrogate a student at school. "Such policies are untenable: school personnel must cooperate with the local police in the performance of their duties. . . . When possible, school personnel should notify the students' parents prior to the interrogation."[10] This seems to be a rather simplistic approach to a problem of infinite complexity. If a student is eighteen, he or she has the right to be represented by an attorney when interrogated by police. If the student is a minor, doesn't he or she have the right to have parents informed prior to interrogation by police? On the one hand the report talks about requiring detailed reports of school incidents involving violence, vandalism, assaults, etc. On the other hand it talks about the sanctity of student records and the student's right to privacy. Reconciling these two approaches is extremely difficult when police and other agencies are involved. But beyond these considerations there are issues of constitutional guarantees against self-incrimination, and there are other legal implications dealing with student rights.

References

1. **Windows to the Bureaucracy**. A publication of the National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development. Room 308, 1111-20th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 200036, 1973, p. 3.

2. Ibid., pp. A1-A5.
3. **The Reform of Secondary Education**, p. 25. See page ii of the Introduction to this volume.
4. See for example, The Philadelphia Board of Education Greenfield Commission Report on Decentralization, 1970.
5. Op. cit., pp. 127-128. See page x of the Introduction to this volume.
6. See figures taken from the National Education Association's draft of a proposed "Program for Displaced Educators and Students," 1972. See also, for example, Barnard C. Watson's "Survival, Phase II: Unity Without Uniformity," a position paper prepared for the Education Policy and Information Center, National Urban League, Inc., 1972.
7. See the **Manpower Report of the President to the Congress** (Washington, D.C., Government Printing Office, 1973, p. 273-274).
8. Op. cit., pp. 49-50. See page viii of the Introduction to this volume.
9. Ibid., p. 115. See page ix of the Introduction to this volume.
10. Ibid., p. 123.

RIGHTS OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS AND REFORM

Herbert C. Hudgins, Jr.

This discussion proceeds under four main headings: (A) *Summary and Forecast*; (B) *The Courts and Student Rights*; (C) *The Courts and Teachers Rights*; and (D) *General Conclusion*.

Summary and Forecast

Against the backdrop of court decisions to be reviewed in this discussion, one is amazed at what the Report ignores. With respect to the Report, only recommendation 31 gets at the rights of teachers when it calls for equal treatment of the sexes. Although the Report calls for innovations or alternatives to education, it fails to examine the legal parameters within which they may operate. Further, it fails to clarify sufficiently just what the teacher's role is expected to be. The Commission members seem to be more acutely interested in and concerned about issues one would expect to arise from various pressure groups. In treating these issues, the Report overlooks some more basic problems. Among the missing pieces is a philosophical framework within which schools do or should function. Given this framework, the details of the school program will and should vary from district to district. It becomes apparent what a school community expects of its schools, and goal statements and strategies are then identified. It becomes clearer not only what a teacher *can* do and become but also what that person *should* do.

Herbert C. Hudgins, Jr., Duke University Ed.D., is a Professor of Educational Administration at Temple University where he specializes in school law.

The Report treats more fully the question of student rights and shows evidence of some familiarity with recent court decisions. Again, however, the Report is incomplete. Of this writer's fourteen references to various legal questions involving students, the Report considers less than one-third of them. With respect to their recommendation on corporal punishment, the Commission members reflect the thinking of some lay groups; the proposal is contrary to the most recent case law. On the matter of a school code of behavior, the Commission is generally on sound ground. It is questionable, however, if all school rules and regulations can be codified. Curiously, the Report expresses concern about suspension and expulsion while remaining silent on other types of discipline. With its recommendation on press freedom, the Report treats only one case, that involving a procedural question. The Report should have focused on both the substantive and procedural rights of the student press. Further, it should have explored the responsibilities that students have in assuming more press freedom. The recommendation on the privacy and access to student records is generally sound. However, the Commission should not have overlooked the possible psychological consequences arising out of release of information to students. Further, concrete guidelines to teachers on what information to put in the records would have been helpful. Regarding student activities, the Commission fails to mention athletics, a current litigious issue. Moreover, it eschews treating segregation in general while settling for the innocuous discussion of academic discrimination in clubs.

For the Report to be considered anywhere near complete, it should have examined the other areas to be referred to in this analysis. Even beyond that, however, one is advised to remember that it is unwise as well as difficult to offer simplistic solutions for complex problems involving both students' and teachers' rights. One is again cautioned against making sweeping generalizations about principles that may or may not be applicable to most school districts. The courts cannot, do not, and do not want to, become a super school board. Indeed, local control still is well and functioning. The variable and flexible standards of the rights question reveal this. One need be reminded only of such phrases as "reasonable," "fairness," "necessity for the regulation," "rational action," "preserving order," among others, to note that one set of rules simply cannot be applied throughout all school districts of the country.

The activism of courts in recent years is reflected nowhere more than in decisions affecting the rights of individuals. A number of guarantees of the Bill of Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment have been called into play to protect, define, and clarify the right of the individual in society. In particular, judicial activism has been reflected in cases brought by both students and teachers. Issues that were unchallenged two decades ago have been entertained by both state and federal courts. Interestingly, judges have had to wrestle with the question of whether students and teachers are subject to one set of controls while at school and another set away from school. They have also had to decide whether the school is a special kind of organization which would justify a code unique for that situation.

This *Summary and Forecast* concludes with two subdivisions presenting further background for intelligent consideration of the rights of students and teachers in relation to the Report; (1) *The Traditional Stance*, and (2) *Recent Activism*.

The Traditional Stance

For many years, both students and teachers were subject to a number of controls imposed by the school, either explicitly or implicitly. It was assumed that while they were actually functioning in the school setting, they would be subject to a number of controls: state laws, local school board policies, and individual school regulations. The legality of these controls was seldom questioned, for the teacher merely had to assent to the rule or find employment elsewhere; for the student it was assumed that the agencies setting up the controls acted in good faith and with the knowledge of what was best for the individual. One had little or no recourse in the courts if he felt the action against him was unjust, unfair, or illegal. Judges would not overturn a board policy or an administrative regulation unless it was shown that school officials had acted arbitrarily, capriciously, or unreasonably in making or enforcing policy; the wisdom or unwisdom of the policy was not questioned. Instead, judges assumed that administrators were experts in their field and consequently in the best position to make sound educational decisions.

Recent Activism

In more recent years the courts have begun to recognize explicitly and acknowledge candidly that both students and teachers have fundamental rights that cannot be abridged by the mere fact that they are either employed by or attend the schools. *Tinker* affirmed this most clearly when it stated that their rights "do not stop at the schoolhouse gate."[1] The question is what these rights are and what are their consequences for the schools? As one answers these questions, **The Reform of Secondary Education** is viewed, on balance, as being partially a guide for reform and also a soapbox plea for some special causes.

Before responding to the recommendations for reform as they apply to both teachers and students, one must first be alerted to avert four specific dangers:

(1) *The Non-Universality of Court Decisions*—A court decision is applicable to its immediate jurisdiction, although in a larger sense, it has persuasive value to a factual situation similar to it. However, state laws vary considerably in their provisions for control and direction of education, and a court holding which interprets a given state statute may not be applicable in another state.

(2)*The Importance of Legal Preparation for the Case*—Many cases are won or lost on the basis of skillful (or unskillful) preparation of them rather than on the merits of the controversy itself. One must be prepared to show clearly a reason for a rule or regulation, to show that it was not arrived at arbitrarily, and to demonstrate that it was applied fairly. These matters may be as persuasive to a judge as the question of the contested right itself. In short, the judge must be given a rational explanation of the action that school officials took.

(3) *The Importance of the Constitutional Issue*—When a constitutional issue is raised, the decision has greater application than a state court ruling. This does not negate however, the possibility that a constitutional issue may not be universally applied in the schools. One is dealing with the subtleties of law as well as with general applications of it. For instance, a dress code policy would likely vary between a seashore community and an isolated mountain community, even though a First Amendment question is raised.

(4) *The Difficulty of Reaching a Balanced Judgment*—Courts often resolve civil liberties matters by weighing the necessity of the state in perpetuating and in protecting itself

against the individual losing any of his rights. This is the crucial problem with which courts have had to wrestle over the last decade and a half, and the present judgment is a mixed one. To a considerable degree, the courts have expanded the rights of both students and teachers. This expansion has transpired through an interpretation of the Constitution as selected portions of it apply to the individuals in question. Courts have not taken from school officials their right to organize and manage the schools; neither have they ruled that there is no necessity of having rules of operation in order that the campus may function. What the judges have stated is that there must be a need for the regulation, and its effect must be to maintain the system as well as to further in a meaningful way the cause of education. This implies that the day of the arbitrary administrator is out, but it does not mean that an administrator may not take decisive action when needed. He may not be upheld if he acts solely out of his own conviction, bias, or whim, as opposed to showing a rational concern for the action taken.

What has come out of recent court decisions is a standard of fairness or reasonableness. The principles underlining this standard may be seen more clearly as they have emerged from many court decisions. These principles can then become measuring sticks against the Report as well as serving, in a larger sense, as guides for any secondary school student or educator.

The Courts and Student Rights

This discussion proceeds under four subheadings: (1) *Student Rights and the First Amendment*; (2) *Student Rights and the Fourth Amendment;* (3) *Student Rights and the Eighth Amendment*; and (4) *Student Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment.*

Student Rights and the First Amendment

The First Amendment guarantees of freedom of speech and press have been questioned as to the extent they apply to students while at school. The speech question has been raised, particularly with regard to dress, symbolic speech (defined below), hair styles and lengths, and flag salute requirements. The courts have handed down a number of decisions and have given some clarification on these matters.

To a considerable degree, the courts have been quite preoccupied with the issue of the degree of freedom a student has concerning his dress. The matter has included length as well as type of clothing. Courts have been asked to decide if a skirt was too short, a blouse too tight, trousers appropriate for females and dungarees for males, and if wearing no socks and shoes was acceptable. A number of courts have failed to see a constitutional issue here while others have squared the matter directly with First Amendment rights.[2]

Closely allied with the dress problem is the issue of length and style of hair. Since 1965, the year of the first haircut case, to the present time, well over 150 decisions involving hair cases have been handed down by both federal and state courts.[3] On this issue, the courts have not been in agreement. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly refused to accept appeals and render a definitive decision.

The courts have variously upheld boards of education, warned officials that the need for the regulation must first be established, upheld students, and refused to act on the matter. Despite these very mixed decisions of the courts, three guidelines emerge rather clearly as controlling factors in regulating student appearance: preservation of order, nondisruption of the educational program, and health

and safety of all concerned. If school officials can establish a justification for the regulation on any or all of these grounds, it will be upheld.

Closely allied with the matter of dress and hair is symbolic speech—the wearing of buttons, armbands, and other manifestations of speech. As contrasted with the hair and dress cases, courts have been more consistent in determining to what degree students can wear these symbols. In 1966 it was held that unless there were evidence of disruption, students should be allowed to wear the buttons in question. On the other hand, when such action leads to an impairment of the normal operation of the school program and when the rights of other students are placed in jeopardy, school officials can take reasonable measures to curtail the activity.[4]

The United States Supreme Court has spoken specifically on the matter of symbolic speech. In the *Tinker* decision it used as a standard for a regulation forbidding symbolic expression, evidence of "substantial and material disruption." That is, an undifferentiated fear of what possibly might happen is insufficient grounds in itself to curb the activity. If it can be shown rather clearly that violence or disruption may result, officials may take appropriate action. The expectation of disruption must be more than sheer guesswork. A widely cited case after *Tinker* allowed school officials to restrict the wearing of any kind of symbolic insignia, because they had clearly shown a need for the prohibition. The rule had been in effect for many years, it had been arbitrary, it had been fair.[5]

The First Amendment has protected students in assembling, in protesting, and in demonstrating otherwise, provided the action is peaceful and nondisruptive. The question of demonstrations has not been entertained by the courts so frequently as other First Amendment questions and since demonstrations now are relatively rare, the courts have largely ceased hearing them.[6]

The requirement that students salute the flag remains a legal issue. A number of years ago students were excused from the requirement for reasons of religious conviction. However, more recently, the requirement has been questioned on other grounds as well, political ideology being the primary one. Several courts have exempted students from having to participate in the pledge exercises if their individual tenets and political beliefs were in conflict with the language of the pledge. These court decisions have been interpreted to mean that a student does not have to stand during the ceremony. Furthermore, a teacher is forbidden to penalize a student for failure to stand or for leaving the room. Protecting the student in his right to believe as he wishes plus not requiring him to participate in the pledge is of greater constitutional import than forcing him to say what he does believe.[7]

The courts have also questioned the degree of freedom that students have in publishing and disseminating material on campus as a part of their guarantee of freedom of the press. This issue did not appear before the courts until 1968. With respect to content, a student may be subjected to more standards than the commercial press. He may, nontheless, exercise considerable freedom with respect to content of the paper. He may take issue with and be critical of the administration and treat controversial, contemporary topics related or unrelated to the school program. It is less clear to what extent the student may use objectionable or obscene language and print pornography. The difficulty here lies in defining the terms concretely. It is evident that courts have avoided addressing themselves to the topic directly, for judges do not wish to set themselves up as censors. They have indicated

that school officials may restrict the use of obscene or libelous material.[8] School officials may also set guidelines for prior approval of material to be published. The guidelines should be such that they are readily known to the students bound by them, explain the procedures to be used in submitting material for approval, define the time period for submission, reaction, and return, as well as explain what might be unacceptable to the administration. The courts have restrained themselves from setting standards of what content may or may not be acceptable, but they have indicated that school officials should be very specific and fair in regulating content and procedure for approval or disapproval.[9]

Student Rights and the Fourth Amendment

The Fourth Amendment protects citizens from unreasonable searches and seizures, and a search may be conducted only upon probable cause and after the issuance of a warrant. In their official line of duty, principals make a number of routine searches of the school premises. They check the plant for fire hazards, cleanliness, and safety. More recently, they have had to inspect the buildings carefully for narcotics. When they conduct searches of items belonging to students, the question arises as to whether they are bound by the same restrictions that apply to law enforcement officials in general. This is the Fourth Amendment provision that holds that one's property can be searched only on probable cause and with the issuance of a warrant.

The doctrine of *in loco parentis* has consistently been given its strongest support and approval here. Courts have reaffirmed the right of administrators to engage in searches at school and without the two restrictions placed on law enforcement officials.[10] The principal has not only the responsibility but also the duty to protect students and the school environment from harmful influences. In this line of duty, the principal is not acting as an agent or employee of the state but in the capacity of a wise and concerned parent.

The search question first considered the matter of student lockers. Courts ruled that the locker is the property of the state instead of the student. As search questions extended to include student cars on campus, the courts reaffirmed the necessity that school officials take all prudent measures to protect the welfare of the involved student as well as other school personnel. Thus, a warrant was not necessary in inspecting student-owned property, a motor vehicle. School officials have also been upheld in requiring students to empty effects from their pockets when it was reasonably believed that the suspect was harboring drugs.[11] The courts have not yet entertained the question as to whether or not a school official can forcibly search a student's person. If this is forbidden, would one be guilty of assault and battery? Officials seem to have stopped short of taking this drastic measure.

Student Rights and the Eighth Amendment

A few cases involving student rights have alleged a violation of the Eighth Amendment, that is, the action taken against the student constituted cruel and unusual punishment. This allegation has been made with respect to dress (requiring students to cut their hair) and corporal punishment (physically striking a student). The courts have refused, however, to support students in this notion and have consistently rejected their arguments.

Student Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment

The Fourteenth Amendment has often been cited as a source for the protection of student rights. Most notably, it was used in the support of black children to be assigned to a desegregated school. Most recently, it has been cited as protecting students for a variety of reasons based on equal protection and due process.

With increasing regularity and recognition of the value and desirability of an education, courts have questioned the action of school officials in excluding students from school. This is premised on a denial of equal protection of the law. Courts have likewise held that in the absence of statutes or school board policies to the contrary, school officials may use reasonable measures including corporal punishment, in disciplining students. In this respect, courts have not deviated from their earlier holdings about student control for misbehavior. The same general guidelines also remain in effect: consideration for the age, sex, health, physical condition of the individual, relating the punishment to the rule the student broke, refraining from punishing a student while angry, and causing no permanent harm to the pupil.

Following the holding of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Gault*,[12] in which it was held that the Bill of Rights was not meant to be applied to adults only, school officials began to question to what extent students have procedural due process rights in the school setting, particularly in discipline matters. Juvenile law today does not grant to young people all the legal safeguards adults have. Similarly, in a suspension or expulsion hearing at school, a student is not automatically assured a hearing with accompanying legal safeguards. If, however, the alleged misconduct is very serious and the penalty likely to be very severe, a hearing with some due process is assured the student. It includes notice of charges, right to a hearing, notification of and time to prepare for the hearing, and right to present witnesses. The hearing itself is an administrative conference, not a court trial. The test of its legality is two-fold: reasonableness and fairness.[13]

The Fourteenth Amendment has given additional protection to married students. School officials cannot restrict, per se, a married student from engaging in extra class activities available otherwise to nonmarried students. Stated differently, classification of students on the basis of their marital status is suspect. Any attempt to penalize a student solely on the basis of marital status is prohibited.[14]

A number of court decisions in the 1970s have affirmed or reaffirmed the right of all students to attend a public school at state expense. The fact that one has a physical or mental infirmity does not bar the student from receiving the same opportunity to an education that other students enjoy. These cases involved persons identified as requiring "special education" who had previously been excluded from attending public schools.[15]

A few cases have involved the question of the right of a student, and other interested persons having a legitimate reason, to examine his school record. The permanent or cumulative file has been interpreted as being a legal or quasi-legal document and thus subject to the state law bearing on the release of such documents. The laws of the various states vary greatly from no legislation covering release of student records to rather specific guidelines. Some states have statutes that allow only limited inspection, for to provide otherwise, the legislators reason, would lead to an invasion of the student's privacy. In the most recent comprehensive

treatment of this question, *Butler et al.* concluded that "a person may inspect quasi-public records if the person can establish, to the satisfaction of the court, a justifiable interest in the record."[16] More specifically they stated, "In the absence of constitutional, legislative, or administrative rules, a parent has the right under common law to inspect public school records of his child because of the parental 'interest' maintained in the parent-child relationship."[17] Since there are a limited number of court decisions in this area, and since state laws which control the issue vary greatly, further generalizations are unwise at this time.

Another area of developing law treats the matter of girls being allowed to participate in sports formerly open only to boys. Based on a relatively few decisions that have been handed down in the 1970's, two trends seem to be developing. The school must provide the same opportunities for girls that boys have to participate in interscholastic athletics. In some jurisdictions courts have declined to allow girls to play on the same team with boys if each sex has its own sport. In those cases where courts have held that girls may not play on the same team, the refusal is usually based on the fact that the game involves physical contact.[18]

The Courts and Teacher Rights

This discussion proceeds under three subheadings: (1) *Teacher Rights and the First Amendment*; (2) *Teacher Rights and the 14th Amendment*; and (3) *The Civil Rights Acts of 1871, 1964 (and 1972 Amendments)*.

Just as with students, in recent years courts have been redefining the rights of teachers. Although the legal decisions involving teachers have been fewer than those involving students, the courts have nonetheless been active in clarifying the rights that teachers do possess. In the first place, a teacher has no right *per se* to teach. The federal Constitution and the various state constitutions do not insure employment to anyone. This right is conditioned by the various laws which set qualifications and standards governing just who may enter the profession.

The judicial activism that pervades the teaching profession is a characteristic of the post-World War II period, when teachers began in earnest to challenge state laws and local school board authority. Teachers began to resent being subject to laws and regulations affecting and controlling their very lives, while many lawmakers felt that the greater good accrued by passing laws to protect young people and the schools from alleged subversive influences.

Teacher Rights and the First Amendment

Following the second World War, many states enacted loyalty oath laws which required one of two things: (1) a teacher's fidelity in agreeing to support, uphold, and defend the Constitution of the United States and of one's given state plus adhering to state laws and local school board regulations, and (2) a teacher's swearing not to engage in any subversive activity designed to undermine or overthrow the government. On these two questions the courts have taken a less firm position than have the legislators. With considerable consistency the judges have upheld the positively-stated oath laws while invalidating the negatively-structured ones.[19] The latter are viewed as being subject to various interpretations and lacking in specificity of measurement, that is, one does not know what activity is allowable and what is forbidden. Over the last two decades the

judges have apparently felt that, on balance, there is no compelling need to justify restricting a person's behavior for the stated purpose of enhancing security. A greater cause is served in allowing one to exercise his academic freedom.

Teachers may exercise considerable freedom in determining with what organizations they wish to affiliate. While it is proper and legal to inquire into a person's fitness to teach, the scope of investigation that pervades the totality of one's organizations, memberships, and contributions exceeds the legitimate bounds of permissibility in screening teachers for fitness.[20]

While outside the school setting, teachers have considerable academic freedom not subject to school control. Among these freedoms that teachers enjoy is the right to participate in politics, including speechmaking and running for office. The right also extends to teachers expressing their views on given subjects, including education.[21]

A teacher's behavior outside school may be subject to regulation if the behavior itself has a detrimental effect on the school environment or results in a breakdown of the teacher-pupil relationship wherein effective discipline and respect cannot be maintained. One's behavior otherwise, while not necessarily looked upon with approval, may not be subject to a school administrator's arbitrary standard.[22]

Within the classroom teachers have considerable freedom in determining content and methodology. The content is not without some regulations, however. It may be subject to state laws that either require or forbid the teaching of a given subject or idea. Beyond this restriction, local school boards may adopt policies that require or forbid certain teachings. In either case, however, the state or the local school system can exceed its authority, particularly if the regulation infringes on one's First Amendment rights. One has considerable freedom in teaching a theory or an idea while not advocating either of them as being truth or accepted practice.[23]

The same general principle holds with respect to religion in the schools. The First Amendment forbids public school teachers from teaching religion as distinguished from teaching *about* religion. An objective study of religion in history and literature would be acceptable to the First Amendment standard of the purpose and effect of the practice.[24]

More recently, courts have had to wrestle with the matter of the freedom a teacher has in treating controversies, particularly those that may be termed as being pornographic or obscene. Courts are loath to set themselves up as censors, and judges often avoid the issue by determining to what extent academic freedom applies to teachers in teaching material that may be offensive or repulsive. The general standard to which courts now subscribe is determining the context within which the material is taught. If it can be shown that there is a legitimate interest in and need for the study, it may be justified and approved by the courts.[25]

With respect to the methodology employed in teaching, courts have deferred usually to local school officials and teachers in allowing them to determine what is best or acceptable. The determination of teacher strategies involves a professional judgment better decided by educators than by judges.

To a considerable degree, the matter of teacher dress is no less subject to school regulation than the standard used for students. If one's dress or appearance tends to disrupt the school decorum, he may have to alter it. On the other hand, male teachers have been protected in their right to wear a beard, moustache, or long hair, and female teachers have been upheld in wearing slacks or

pantsuits without there being any showing that one's appearance caused a disruption.[26]

Teacher Rights and the Fourteenth Amendment

For many years teachers have been protected in their employment through job security. Forty states now have tenure legislation which protects teachers from arbitrary or capricious dismissal. That is, before a teacher on tenure can be dismissed, there must first be just cause for the decision and an orderly procedure followed in the actual dismissal. The causes must be specified in the statutes; the dismissal procedure must be followed exactly.

In those states in which teachers do not have tenure, state statutes control the rights that teachers have prior to dismissal. In some states these rights are nil; in other states they vary. The Supreme Court of the United States decided in 1972 that the rights of tenured and non-tenured teachers are not the same. They are identical only insofar as one has an expectancy of continued employment.[27]

The Civil Rights Acts of 1871, 1964 (and 1972 Amendments)

The Civil Rights Act of 1871 protects teachers from being disciplined or discharged for exercising a constitutionally protected right. If an administrator were to discipline a teacher for acting under color of rights guaranteed by the Constitution, the teacher may have cause for relief in federal court. The relief may take one of two forms: equity or damages. The equitable relief remedies the situation, while damages may be paid by the individual who denied the right to the teacher.

Within recent years teachers have increasingly come under the protection of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its 1972 amendments creating the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The EEOC forbids job discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The act also forbids nonemployment or discontinuance of fringe benefits due to maternity leave. A maternity leave policy that arbitrarily designates a specified time for a pregnant teacher to go on maternity leave is in violation of the equal protection clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. The matter of when to go on maternity leave is more properly determined by the teacher and her physician, for pregnancy in and of itself does not connote incapacity to teach.[28]

General Conclusion

The Report does reveal some complex problems, and it is to be commended for this. What is needed is more thorough treatment of those issues with options presented in solving them. Just as great a need is treatment of topics the Report overlooked; it is unclear why members chose to identify some rather specific problems while not considering others.

The Report will serve a purpose in stimulating discussion about education and how to improve the secondary schools. The danger is in not being fully apprised that this document is not balanced in its treatment of the subject. The real reform of education can and should become a reality only after a comprehensive study of the problem has been made, and after solutions that are realistic, attainable, and otherwise for the best interests of all segments of the educational community have been offered. This may suggest that a major observation should be made in summation: there are some problems in education that will likely never be solved.

References

1. **Tinker** v. **Des Moines Independent School District**, 393 U.S. 503 (1969).
2. A comprehensive bibliography of cases on this subject is available from the National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, Topeka, Kansas.
3. Ibid.
4. See in particular **Blackwell** v. **Issaquena County Board of Education**, 363 F. 2d 749 (1966) and **Burnside** v. **Byars**, 363 F. 2d 744 (1966).
5. **Guzick** v. **Drebus**, 431 F. 2d 594 (1970).
6. Three of the most recent court decisions are the following: **Tate** v. **Board of Education**, 453 F 2d 975 (1972), **Gebert** v. **Hoffman**, 336 F. Supp. 694 (1972), and **Dunn** v. **Tyler Independent School District**, 460 F. 2d 137 (1972).
7. See for example, **Frain** v. **Baron**, 307 F. Supp. 27 (1969), **Hanover** v. **Northrup**, 325 F. Supp. 170 (1970), **Banks** v. **Board of Public Instruction of Dade County**, 314 F. Supp. 285 (1970), and **Russo** v. **Central School District No. 1**, 469 F. 2d 623 (1972).
8. **Schwartz** v. **Schuker**, 298 F. Supp. 238 (1969), **Scoville** v. **Board of Education of Joliet Township**, 415 F. 2d 860 (1970), **Vought** v. **Van Buren Public Schools**, 306 F. Supp. 1388 (1969).
9. **Eisner** v. **Stamford Board of Education**, 440 F. 2d 803 (1971), **Quarterman** v. **Byrd**, 453 F. 2d 54 (1971), **Shanley** v. **Northeast Independent School District**, 462 F. 2d 960 (1972).
10. **In Re Donaldson**, 75 Cal. Rptr. 220 (1969), **Stein** v. **Kansas**, 456 P. 2d 1 (1969), **People** v. **Overton**, 249 N.E. 2d 366 (1969).
11. **Keene** v. **Rodgers**, 316 F. Supp. 217 (1970), **Ranniger** v. **State**, 460 S.W. 2d 181 (1970).
12. **In Re Gault**, 387 U.S. 1 (1967).
13. See **Madera** v. **Board of Education**, 386 F. 2d 778 (1967), **Goldwyn** v. **Allen**, 281 N.Y.S. 2d 889 (1966), **Carney** v. **Board**, 231 S. 2d 34 (1970), **Cosme** v. **Board of Education of the City of New York**, 270 N.Y.S. 2d 231 (1966), **Farrell** v. **Joel**, 437 F. 2d 160 (1971), **Banks** v. **Board of Public Instruction**, 314 F. Supp. 285 (1970), **Davis** v. **Ann Arbor Public Schools**, 313 F. Supp. 1217 (1970), **Givens** v. **Poe**, 346 F. Supp. 202 (1972), **Betts** v. **Board of Education of Chicago**, 466 F. 2d 629 (1972).
14. **Moran** v. **School District**, 350 F. Supp. 1180 (1972), **Holt** v. **Shelton**, 341 F. Supp. 821 (1972), **Davis** v. **Meek**, 344 F. Supp. 298 (1972).
15. The landmark decision is **PARC** v. **Commonwealth of Pennsylvania**, 344 F. Supp. 1257 (1971). See also **Mills** v. **Board of Education of the District of Columbia**, 348 F. Supp. 866 (1972).
16. Butler, Henry E., Jr., K. D. Moran, and Floyd A. Vanderpool, Jr., **Legal Aspects of Student Records**. Topeka: National Organization on Legal Problems of Education, 1972, p. 26.
17. Ibid., p. 31.
18. **Reed** v. **Nebraska School Activities Association**, 341 F. Supp. 258 (1972), **Brenden** v. **Independent School District**, 342 F. Supp. 1224 (1972), **Haas** v. **South Bend Community School Corporation**, 289 N.E. 2d 495 (1972), **Bucha** v. **Illinois High School Association**, 351 F. Supp. 69 (1972).
19. **Wieman** v. **Updegraff**, 344 U.S. 183 (1952), **Cramp** v. **Board of**

31

Public Instruction of Orange County, 368 U.S. 278 (1961), Baggett v. Bullitt, 377 U.S. 360 (1964), Elfbrandt v. Russell, 384 U.S. 11 (1966), Keyishian v. Board of Regents of the University of the State of New York, 385 U.S. 589 (1967).

20. Shelton v. Tucker, 364 U.S. 479 (1960).
21. See in particular Pickering v. Board of Education, 391 U.S. 563 (1968).
22. For a most recent treatment of a variety of cases touching on this issue, see Hudgins, "The Law and Teacher Dismissal," Nation's Schools, XCIII (March 1974).
23. Epperson v. State of Arkansas, 393 U.S. 97 (1968).
24. School District of Abington Township v. Schempp, 374 U.S. 203 (1968).
25. See for example Webb v. Lake Mills Community School District, 344 F. Supp. 791 (1972), and Lindros v. Governing Board, 103 Cal. Rptr. 188 (1972).
26. Finot v. City Board of Education, 58 Cal. Rptr. 520 (1967), Braxton v. Board of Public Instruction of Duval County, 303 F. Supp. 958 (1969).
27. Roth v. Board of Regents, 408 U.S. 564 (1972), Perry v. Sindermann, 403 U.S. 593 (1972).
28. Cleveland Board of Education v. La Fleur and Cohen v. Chesterfield County School Board, 42 L.W. 4186 (January 21, 1974).

UNRESOLVED POLITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE REFORM OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

B. Paul Komisar

Summary and Forecast

The Reform of Secondary Education was prepared by yet another national commission. So we expect a report long on prescription but short on diagnosis, a response to symptoms but evasion of basic malady, and writing distinguished by frequency of internal contradiction. We get these flaws and others as well. But what is welcome in the Report is the surprisingly robust and timely, though incompletely developed, vision of a new ideological (mainly political) basis for public secondary education. A major strength of the Commission's Report is that it recommends public recognition and even provision of accredited learning opportunities outside of schools. That is, public policy for education should be more than policy determined by the schools alone.

The Commission offers its recommendations to help the outdated custodial school system adjust to rapid social change. Put briefly, the Commission holds that our custodial schools with compulsory attendance allow educators to take responsibility for directing all the learning and much of the total lives of students. The result is that school people have too large a share of responsibility at the expense of the general public, parents, and the young themselves. The school, then, tends to become a virtually dictatorial paternal institution.

The remainder of this essay comments on a number of issues under two main headings which in turn reflect the conflicts in the underlying

B. Paul Komisar, A University of Illinois Ed.D. in Philosophy of Education, is Professor of Philosophy of Education at Temple University.

public education situation and the contradictions within the Report. The first main heading, (A) *From Paternalism to Participation*, touches upon the rights and duties of the public, students, and school people. The second main heading, (B) *From Public Conflicts to Contradictory Report* questions the Commission's ability to deal with the problem, its tactics (rhetoric), and whether teachers and students can play their proper roles when the student is both a participant in developing his own educational program and a recipient (or beneficiary) of that program from his teachers.

From Paternalism to Participation

As a consequence of two recent educational crises—the demand for better academic achievement in the '50s, and the libertarian revolt in the '60s—public opinion has shifted from support of the custodial schools and toward greater participation in the development of school policy. The Commission's response to this shift is to recommend new bases to accommodate the demands of all the participants in public education. They propose to achieve this through a reassignment and clarification of the rights (opportunities) and duties (obligations) of the public, students, and school-people. Following is a capsule statement of the Commission's recommendations.

The school people may keep the right to determine educational goals, but they are obliged to define them for public and student awareness. In addition the schools are given the right and limited authority to require responsible behavior from students who choose to remain in school after age 14. The schools have the duty to provide career-related instruction and information (it puzzles me that the Commission assigns employment services to the schools). Finally, schools are obliged to offer alternative curricula within their walls and promote educational programs (vocational, among others) outside in the community. The schools are also expected to co-operate in a testing program whereby out-of-schoolers may gain school credit toward certificates. The corresponding rights of school-people are not mentioned (a significant omission), but I suppose these rights might include an expectation of a more educationally conducive school environment and students who act more like participants than inmates.

The public for its part is expected to provide the young with credentials and equitable financing for school and relevant non-school achievement and to extend school *opportunities* to grade fourteen. Naturally, the public finances the whole scheme, but (and this is a surprise) the public will expect community service or token repayment from youth and accountability from school-people.

The student role is similarly a balance of rights and duties. School attendance after age 14 is a right, not an obligation, and it is a right which may be exercised part-time and at any stage in life. Students, I assume, are expected to *show* achievement for credentials, but the achievement need not be solely in school activities. When in school the students will have a specified code of rights to protect essential values (privacy, due process), but they will be held accountable for misdemeanors.

Now this vision of revitalizing public schooling through a balance of rights and duties of participants is nothing but the old social contract theory applied to education. We are even spurred on by a whiff of the Hobbesian view of the state of nature in the discussion of the "crisis in security." The point is well taken, of course. If an institution cannot offer physical security, then it is indeed true that it needs a new basis for legitimacy.

So the Commission does have an apt and useful vision for our time; and to the degree that they have the courage and clarity to enforce it, they are to be applauded for penetrating to the center of the present predicament.

Sadly, this vision of a new politically-based ideology for education is not always clearly and consistently conceived. For example, though the Commission is no mere mouthpiece for recent libertarian views, they do shy away from stating the obligations of youth (and corresponding rights of public and professionals) as extensively and rigorously as they assert student rights.

From Public Conflicts to Contradictory Report

More seriously, I am not sure the Commission sees what their own conception of rights-duties entails, or how fundamental a change it represents. In this, they may be misled by the rhetoric in their own account of the present predicament. They parade the cliché that the school is slow to adjust to rapid social change. But more realistically, the present predicament is caused by contradictory, nearly irreconcilable, views of what schools should be, ranging from strong approval of the very custodial school impugned in the Report to the notorious position that the school system itself is a vestigial institution. In the face of this conflict, slow school change is only a symptom and, as with many another symptom, it can benefit the host. Through its balance of rights and duties, the Report shows a way of turning untenable conflict into working differences. What is puzzling is that the Report makes the moral charge of tardy school change, but is in itself a precise clinical response to the predicament caused by conflict.

This is not the only instance where Commission actions belie their rhetoric. It also occurs in their morality play about school-people. The professionals are cast as villains, repressing youth and thwarting public participation in school policy, while aggrandizing power unto themselves. But the solution offered is irrelevant to this morality tale. The social contract embodies a substitute for the paternal politics of education. The idea that community interests combine to establish "what is best for the young to learn" is fundamental to public school policy-making. (Indeed the Commission is not above engaging in some of this politics themselves, regarding global education for example.) But is the Commission seriously suggesting that school people invented paternalism and foisted it on the community as the paradigm for school policy-making?

So the claim that professionals exploited the paternal school, whether true or not, misses the underlying problems of the Report. Presumably, youth object to being recipients of paternalism (or subjects of oppression, as some might prefer to describe it). The contractual proposal is an exact response to this objection; it recognizes the young as able to exercise rights, protect self-interests, and pay the price for choice. This is a very fundamental idea, but it has nothing to do with anyone usurping power. In the place of rhetoric, an explicit discussion of the implications of the Commission's conception of contractual schooling would be more helpful. Having caught our attention with a radical and valuable proposal, their task is to get approval of it as a basis for legitimacy and authority in schooling.

The Report falls in with the rising student autonomy movement, the most recent shift in the historical freedom-order theme. Some of these topics are discussed in other chapters in this volume. But there is one central enigma that requires clarification. It can be illuminated by this question: If

we move from paternal to contractual schooling, then how will this change affect the student's role in the instructional encounter? It seems unlikely that youth will accept a role of subordination in the very instruction they legitimatize as equal contributors to a social contract. And yet on the other side, subordination of the learner is a *necessary* condition of instruction. Such is the enigma. The quick answer, of course, is to abolish instruction and leave youth to direct their own learning. But this has its own difficulties, and at best diverts our attention away from the Report. Neither can the answer be that the school respects the autonomy of the student by providing autonomous teachers for youth to emulate. For a teacher's autonomy consists in *directing* instruction, and we are back at the beginning.

The Report seems to do no more than grope for an answer in their account of goals and objectives. There are sensible suggestions that the school (teachers?) will set goals for its own operations. And in this connection, the only duty laid on the school is to make both the public and youth *aware* of the goals. At other places, it is envisioned that students will pursue "personal goals and objectives" within a framework of educational goals . . . " developed in a participatory way, involving students, parents, and general citizenry, as well as educators." (p. 11) This is a clumsy answer, all conceived and articulated in the obfuscating educational jargon of "goals and objectives." Of course obfuscation may be the whole point. Could they not just say: the schools will teach what they can and must; students may attend when they want what is there? In the end, it is that contradictory rhetoric that does the Report in.

THE REFORM OF SECONDARY TEACHER EDUCATION

Matthew H. Bruce

Summary and Forecast

Can secondary teacher education survive a major re-organization of the nation's secondary schools? This is not a facetious question. Consider the potential for upheaval in teacher education contained in the Report, if its recommendations should become directives for the schools.

An air of non-reality surrounds the implications for teacher education of the recommendations, primarily because they contradict the financially austere future projected in the Report, and secondly because they present serious philosophical problems. This response is not an argument that the general position of the Report is either erroneous or unprincipled. It is simply an assertion that the position is naive to the extent that it builds upon a base that may not exist in reality.

Although the Report appears to speak generally to policy and administrative aspects of secondary education (e.g., who will set goals, how long students remain in school, what security is needed for rest rooms) some points of direct impact on teacher education are either directly addressed or are implied in the recommendations. Important among these are four:

(A) The loose conception of "alternativeness," which has some impact regardless of how it is defined;

A Pennsylvania State University Ph.D., Matthew H. Bruce is Professor of Secondary Education in Science Education at Temple University.

(B) The recommendations for more open, more individualized, more flexible school programs, and the incorporation of more extra-school experiences;

(C) The call for broadening the base of participation in formulating goals of individual secondary schools and for publication of these goals; and

(D) The projection of less financial support for secondary education (and, by extension, for secondary teacher education).

While other components of the Report have implications for teacher education, these are discussed in this response only as they fit into the four major areas noted above.

Little direct attention is given in the Report to teacher education other than the admonition in recommendation 4:

> "Teacher training institutions must revise their programs so that prospective teachers are exposed to the variety of teaching and learning options in secondary education. New teachers should be able to work in several instructional modes.
>
> Extensive in-service programs should be instituted to retain teachers presently employed . . ." (p. 14)

There can be no doubt, however, that the recommendations for the secondary schools if implemented, would have serious ramifications for teacher education institutions. Further, some things *not* dealt with in the Report would affect teacher education in perhaps equally significant ways. More will be said about these in appropriate parts of the following discussion.

A Perspective on Secondary Education

In order to place the four concerns in perspective, it seems necessary to consider the Commission's view of American secondary education against other views. The current secondary school emphasis upon subject matter content and skills is not new, for it has been the major, if unwritten objective of high school education since the establishment of high schools in this country. From time to time, movements such as Core Curriculum, Inquiry, or Process teaching, have attempted to shift the emphasis. Even in the prime of each of these movements, however, classroom observations and examination of test items used by teachers have indicated that the learning of content has remained a prime target of teaching.

In recent years, curriculum projects, often developed through federal funding, have accentuated this emphasis. For example, the act of Congress that instituted the National Science Foundation, with its Course Content Improvement Section and its Pre-College Education Division, states that the prime role of NSF education activities is to ". . . update the *content* of science courses for the school level." (Emphasis added) How courses were taught was of only secondary interest. Further, the movement away from colleges designed to prepare teachers, and toward state-supported, multi-purpose institutions, has meant an even greater emphasis on mastery of content. Also, until recently a significant number of secondary teachers received their undergraduate education in smaller liberal arts colleges, where a "major" in a specific discipline was required, and where content usually overshadowed process in both faculty and student attitudes toward what was important.

Nearly every survey completed in the past fifty years of the teaching assignments of secondary school

teachers has shown that many were assigned to teach subjects in which they were not prepared. Thus many teachers have had to cope with unfamiliar content and skills; this requirement minimized their attention to other aspects of training and in turn worked a hardship on the students.

Today, there is a movement away from content emphasis, exemplified by new emphases, such as values clarification, open and open-space education, individualized instruction, interdisciplinary education and, more recently, "humanistic" education. All these descriptors imply a student-centered teacher style in which the teacher is a manager of classroom activities rather than a dispenser of knowledge. Lack of understanding of the effect of this style by many educators tends to create an educational climate in which the *alternative mode* becomes an end in itself rather than a means for teaching students something substantive.

Not only are the cognitive and/or manipulative objectives for teaching being dealt with in curriculum planning, but affective objectives are also being considered by some teachers and school administrators. At the same time, and surprisingly from some of the same people, there is a move toward making schools and teachers increasingly accountable, in some formal sense, for the results of their efforts. In an educational system attempting to become more accountable, however, affective objectives tend to be set aside for reference at some future date; or these objectives are ignored in the accounting process because testing their accomplishment is difficult. This suggests a clear, if unintended, implication of their relative importance. Thus, the schools continue the old pattern of teaching for mastery of content and, less often perhaps, the acquisition of skills.

There is much talk of educating secondary school students to develop a value system; but values are seldom presented for consideration. There is discussion of dealing with individuals and of preparing them to contribute to society; but the offerings of secondary schools include more and more advanced courses in content, and little to enhance the character of individual students. Cell physiology, French IV, advanced electronics and advanced auto shop are often found in even moderate-sized secondary schools. Introductory physical science, including activities which were not long ago part of college physics and chemistry courses, is a common offering in junior high schools today. Mathematics that appeared in advanced college courses only a few years ago has found its way into the "new math" programs in many schools. (This is not to suggest that these advanced courses are bad; it is simply that by themselves, they will not meet the *affective* aims often espoused and, indeed, may hinder their attainment). In order to counteract the negative effects this kind of education is having on too many youngsters, teachers need help not only with the content mastery but with ways to humanize and personalize the content.

What, then, is the view of secondary education presented in the Report, and what implications does it have for teacher education? It is strongly career-oriented, committed to providing alternatives to the traditional program, committed to community participation in goal-setting, and highly sensitive to the rights of students. Against the brief description of secondary education in the preceding paragraphs the Report clearly calls for the schools to make good on what they say about humanism, values, and individualization. If one assumes that teacher preparation today is geared to produce teachers suited to the present *reality* of the schools, then the Report clearly calls for changes in teacher education. It is not, however, very

specific in addressing itself to the implication of its recommendations for teacher education.

Now with this perspective, we can take up the four concerns identified at the outset: (A) *Alternativeness*; (B) *Individualization and Flexibility*; (C) *Broadening the Base*; and (D) *Financial Support*.

Alternativeness

The Report treats "alternativeness" so loosely that a reader may define it as he wishes. This vagueness may have been intentional. Assuming that individual school districts can determine how they achieve their own forms of alternativeness, since goal setting and curriculum development are locally oriented (as indicated in Recommendations 1, 2, and 3), what does this concept imply for teacher education? First, it suggests an almost infinite variety of approaches. This presents a formidable problem for teacher education because the variety of situations into which both student teachers and graduates may move will place a strain on the most flexible preparation programs. That, coupled with the implication that some form of competency-based teacher education program is desirable (Chapter IV), suggests extensive research and program development conducted by teacher education institutions, probably in close conjunction with the schools.

A second implication for teacher education lies in the suggestion of an *attitude* which new teachers—and veterans—had better be prepared to meet. This attitude is exemplified by the assertion that "every adolescent should, with proper guidance, be able to select those forms of schooling and learning most congenial to his basic learning style, philosophical orientation, and tastes" (pp. 99-100). This statement runs counter to the general *operational* mode of secondary education and would require a major change in teacher preparation programs if it were adopted by the educational community and the public.

Perhaps of greatest impact on teacher education institutions, if present secondary school teachers are to implement it, this move toward "alternativeness" implies a major in-service effort. In practice, such a re-gearing of staff would be accomplished in or near the school where the teacher works. Given the probable reduction of financial support emphasized in the Report, this has a further implication affecting the role of colleges and universities providing such in-service work (e.g., agreements with schools or consortia of schools on the instruction required to meet the needs of individual teachers and the dollars-per-head cost of this instruction).

Individualization and Flexibility

Of course individualization of instruction, more flexible school programs, and openness are not original with the Commission. Perhaps the degree to which these ideas are presented *as a general characterization* of a desirable secondary school is unique in the Report.

In one of the few remarks directed straight at teacher education institutions, the Report states that "teacher training (sic) institutions must prepare teachers to diagnose learning difficulties and prescribe appropriate experiences to overcome them." In a related recommendation, not specifically directed at teacher education institutions, the Report states that "individual students must be encouraged to assume major responsibility for the determination of their educational goals, the development of the learning activities needed to meet those goals, and the appraisal of their progress" (pp. 16,

17). These two ideas together suggest the sort of educational climate in which teachers will be expected to function; the major role of the teacher may thus become diagnosis and prescription. Experience with this type of teacher role has produced varying results, but has generally been expensive. When the cost of retraining is included, this seems to represent a contradiction of the projected lower financial support. Further, since neither the materials of instruction nor the teachers for this format exist in the numbers implied by the recommendations, a hard look at the time projections for the needed preparation or re-orientation is necessary. And some assurance—perhaps some careful research—would be welcome proving that this educational mode of diagnosis/prescription/self-actualization/self-assessment is really viable, and not just another phenomenon that would have disappeared from the scene about the time that the schools and colleges had become fully geared to meet its needs.

The selection of students, a major concern of teacher education institutions, is not dealt with in the Report. With the shrinkage of new teachers the schools can absorb, it is reasonable to project some effort at improving selection in order to enhance the quality of those who enter. Admittedly, the results of studies of the selection process have provided little help to date. Something better than the typical 2.5 cumulative average and survival in student teaching simply must be possible as a means of identifying those who will enter teaching. In general, two avenues are open for study: selection at the point of entrance into the teacher preparation program, and *deselection* at some point later on. Selection at the point of entrance is a slippery area, with little real help available from research. As for deselection, some promise is offered by the performance/competency-based teacher education efforts currently under way.* In either case, real progress toward identifying persons in whom to invest the limited dollars available to teacher education will take considerable time. Performance-based teacher education, in particular, is likely to require long-term study to determine its power to produce teachers, both pre- and in-service, who can meet the needs of an educational program of the sort envisioned by the Commission. It is precisely in the study of the effects of formats such as performance-based teacher education, however, that the knowledge required to maintain a viable system of secondary education, staffed by appropriately prepared persons, will be found.

Broadening the Base

Recommendations 1 and 2 state the Commission's view of goals and goal development for the secondary schools. The three basic components are: (1) the need for clear goal statements, made visible to the public; (2) serious participation by the community in the formulation of goals for its schools; and (3) continued restructuring of these goals, and the development (by the schools?) of performance criteria for meeting these goals. Without considering the effect on the schools themselves, what would be the probable effect of the potentially

*At the risk of seeming immodest, the author wishes to point to research being conducted by himself and others at Temple University, utilizing the Intern Teaching Program for College Graduates, aimed specifically at revealing whatever potential exists in the performance-based teacher education mode. Results to the present time suggest both useful potential and limitations to the mode, while clearly pointing to a long-term research program as being necessary to acquire the needed information.

rapid shift in national priorities on the output of the teacher education institutions? (Report, pp. 9, 10, and Chapter III. If we are preparing teachers for change as opposed to multiple skill utilization, we might do well to abandon teacher education and move directly to an apprentice system. While this may be an extreme view of the effect of implementing the goal-setting recommendations, it loses its extreme quality in proportion to the rate at which the national or local priority changes shorten the available lead time required to make time substantive changes in teacher education. This dilemma compounds the problems of utilizing existing staffs while reorienting them.

It is debatable whether the schools' failure to meet current (perhaps transient) social demands is a function of the schools, or through school staffing a function of teacher education—and that therefore a significant increase in direct public control of schools is needed. It has not been demonstrated that the schools' failure is any more attributable to their relative isolation in establishing goals than it is from a lack of clarity and consistency in the messages society sends to the schools and through them to teacher education institutions. This is a moot question.

Financial Support

Financial support is the over-arching concern: the backdrop against which the other areas noted, and, indeed, the Commission's recommendations, must be examined. It is no news that fewer dollars are likely to be made available for secondary education, or education generally, in the years just ahead. Nor is it a surprise that the schools will be expected to meet whatever changes the current social priorities require, but with less money. It is surprising that the Report couples this likelihood of reduced dollars available per student with a set of recommendations which measured by any available yardstick will cost *more* dollars per student. There can be little doubt that a shift has occurred in public mood, away from open-handed support of education. Likewise few will argue that the schools should not be made more humane and more responsive to the needs of the children they serve. Severe problems arise, however, when the mechanisms proposed to accomplish the desired end conflict with the clear prediction of a smaller financial base.

Two examples of dollar-eating consequences of recommendations in the Report should make the point.

The recommendations dealing with changing priorities, and the means to cope with them, suggest some effort on the part of teacher education. Specifically, the recommendations call for expansion of career education opportunities, job placement services, development of "alternative paths" to the diploma, and increased flexibility in scheduling. Coupled with assertions regarding a "decrease in the number of youthful new teachers employed" (p. 5), and the probability that "schools will have to reform through the work of the present staffs, without any great infusion of new blood" (p. 6), these recommendations lead to problems in two ways. First, given the dollar shrinkage, the maintenance of an "aging" staff expecting salaries that will at least keep pace with the economy, consumes a larger proportion of the available money than a staff having more "beginners." While staffs will shrink somewhat through attrition, easing to some extent this financial claim, a second demand on the budget arises. The recommended shift in school functions in the Report requires a re-gearing of the staff to meet program changes. This is going to cost money.

From the standpoint of the teacher education institutions, a second sort of

problem arises. The conjunction of changing demands upon teachers and a greatly reduced number of beginners suggests a reduction of programs for pre-service preparation of teachers and an increase of in-service education programs. Graduate education is generally more expensive than undergraduate. Include the costs of program development, and the dollar difficulties match those faced by the schools. Even with the same sort of staff-shrinkage-through-attrition mentioned in connection with the secondary schools, the prospects are bleak.

Both the above examples are concerned with a single major shift in emphasis. A nagging question remains: since the proposed shift is based on a change in priorities (as seen by the Commission), what happens if in, say, five years there is a popular demand of the "Back to the basics!" variety? Evidence of such a demand is already appearing in some rather startling places.

Reduction in available dollars for education at any level raises the question of what the available dollars will buy. The Report asserts that the massive injections of dollars during the decade of innovation and experimentation of the sixties have had little effect on the schools (p. 7). Yet this leaves a serious question unanswered. The schools *have* changed over this period. If dollars haven't changed them, what has? And what have we learned from it all? Many of the innovations and experiments of the sixties have ostensibly moved in the direction of openness, reduction of constraints on students, both in the learning sense and in the behavioral sense, and alternativeness. What have we learned that might help us implement changes suggested in the Report to help reach the recommended goals? Have we learned anything, for example, that might temper our zeal for change by trying to define what we mean by concepts such as "alternativeness?"

If the failures of the sixties did not result from a dollar shortage, then it must have been a failure of people, or of ideas. What then makes the Commission feel that present staffs, who did not make the innovations of the sixties work with relatively abundant dollars, can now make their suggested innovations work with a projected shortage of dollars? This is not to suggest that the prospect for secondary education is hopeless, rather that the Commission is long on recommendations but short on evidence that their recommendations are workable.

Professional teacher education has produced a body of research on teaching and teacher education; evidence from this source might provide relevant evidence on the viability of some of the Commission's recommendations. For example, evidence on the adolescent's need for increasing autonomy and opportunities for exploration under adult supervision, and evidence on the roles of teachers as models, bear directly on the degree of openness recommended by the Report concerning students' rights, alternativeness, and teacher education. The importance of a national approach to change becomes critical in view of the implications of these elements in the Report. The name of the game is evidence.

How does this discussion relate to teacher education? In several ways: first, whatever shortage of funds affects the secondary schools can affect teacher education as well, perhaps even more forcefully; second, the *nature* of the proposed changes in secondary education, if implemented, would require a substantial in-service education effort, presumably, *though not necessarily*, using the services of teacher education institutions; and third, the need for solid research

evidence on the appropriateness and, eventually, on the success of the proposed changes, places a major responsibility on teacher education research. Time runs through all of this just as money does. While no one expects the recommendations in the Report to be converted overnight into mandates—even if some single agency with the power to do so existed—experience suggests that lead time is a crucial requirement.

It should be noted that the problem of financing secondary education —or public education generally— is given short shrift in the Report. The Commission voices the hope that if their recommendations are implemented, "most other matters will fall in place—or at least they will become manageable" (p. 166). This hope seems unrealistic unless the basis of school financing is revised. The number of school budgets failing to gain public approval by the public, and of school systems operating on the ragged edge of their financial base, provide ample evidence. While the primary concern in this discussion has been the effect on teacher education, one cannot escape the fact that effective teacher education can exist only on the basis of a healthy basic education system. If the schools are in trouble, teacher education is in trouble.

Some Possible Directions

Thus back to the question that opened this response: *Can* teacher education survive a reorganization of the kind implied by the Report? The answer is, probably, yes. But it won't be easy. Despite spasms of change, teacher education is still pretty much what it was thirty years ago. In the light of present conditions of financing and demand, we had better try to determine precisely which way the wind is blowing.

If the primary purpose of secondary education is to "provide educational opportunities to satisfy both the common and unique needs of the individuals who aggregate to the total population," and to provide quality (Report, pp. 25, 26), then with or without implementation of the recommendations in the Report, some greater effort must be made at the college/university level to give those preparing for teaching useful experiences aimed at meeting these goals. Such experiences might be developed in the following ways:

1. Encourage the personalization of college teaching by using as models professors who, through example, place academic objectives in perspective along with others, such as social ones. This means that such teachers must be rewarded for their commitment to teaching.
2. Re-orient the content of some courses in teacher education programs toward problems requiring solution; in particular, problems that are related to the concerns of society. Even process-oriented teaching (or inquiry) has tended to deal too exclusively with the research problems of given disciplines. Instead, some of the problems should be oriented toward social objectives, as the content of the discipline bears on them. Note that this does not eliminate or even minimize content; rather it suggests that social concerns should determine more of the ways in which content is handled.
3. Increase the contact with real classrooms for persons preparing to teach. Two avenues are open: earlier contact, prior to the clinical experience provided by student teaching; and an extended

preparation period—say, a five year program involving a year of paid internship under supervision for all new teachers.

4. Explore alternatives to present teacher education modes. Performance-based teacher education, if adequately researched, may provide an opportunity to do this with a fair chance of success. The pre-test—acquisition strategy—post-test-model has been shown to work for certain areas of academic and pedagogical concern.

GOALS, CURRICULUM AND REFORM

Morton Alpren

Summary and Forecast

We were due for a report on secondary education. This one has some recommendations that needed attention, such as those dealing with compulsory education, violence, alternative paths to completing high school, securing goals from parents and public, lessening the high school's custodial function, and providing for an apprentice system that would make career preparation less exclusively a school function and more one to be shared with industry and labor.

On the other hand there is cause to worry about curricula that would emerge from broad goals designed to be measured by narrow yardsticks. The need for some use of performance criteria is not questioned. The problem is that its advocacy is too sweeping for a school's program. The stress on specific objectives, measurements, and objective testing is fine up to a point. However, they should be limited to some goals, not all, as implied in the Report. The Commission really failed us when they revealed no link between the goals and the recommendations. The goals could have led to an entirely different set of recommendations. The only test for a reader is to see how the transition in thought was made. This was not evident at any point.

Finally, those concerned with secondary education require a debate on curriculum policy. This can come from dealing with certain questions and decisions about curriculum. Perhaps it was too much to expect of the

NOTE: The author is indebted to his colleague, Professor Frank X. Sutman, for his contributions to the ideas presented herein.

A University of Florida (Gainesville) Ed.D., Morton Alpren is Professor of Curriculum Theory and Development and Foundation of Education.

Commission. This discussion is offered as a contribution to the much-needed debate on curriculum policy.

The Report deals with goals and the curriculum of the secondary school. However it does not clearly indicate any relationship between the two. Therefore it seems reasonable here to consider or to emphasize the curriculum as it relates to the goals of secondary education. The Commission is to be commended for securing goals from non-professionals. By not doing so, our secondary schools negate the idea that parents should have a major say in why youth attend school.

What follows is an examination of some questions, followed by some conclusions. The questions are: 1. *How shall we view the goals*? 2. *Is there a priority of goals*? 3. *How do the goals relate to the curriculum recommendations?* 4. *How sound are the recommendations?* 5. *What recommendations might have been made?* 6. *What are the major goals and policy issue?*

How Shall We View the Goals?

Discussions with the other contributors to this response reveal different ways of looking at goals and their significance. Komisar and Watson (Chapters 4 and 2) do not take them seriously. Komisar's position is based on the notion that goals tend to be ignored by practitioners. Watson thinks that the real goals are determined by public policy. Cutler (Chapter 1) views past statements of goals in national reports as either nationalistic or individual but notes that the Report's statements tend to provide a balance.

There is merit in all these positions. However, they do not negate the question, how are we to arrive at a curriculum for a school or for a youngster if we do not first examine why that child is in the school? Hence, the importance of designating goals. Once we establish them, we are in a position to begin a process that can lead to recommending a curriculum. The Commission rendered us a service by not only providing goals but securing them from parents and students as well as administrators and teachers. This helps us focus on two other questions, *viz.*, what priority of goals and which group should be primary in setting this priority?

Is There a Priority of Goals?

The Commission could have answered the two questions raised above but did not make the attempt. This attempt will be made here by using the data furnished in the Report. But first, why is a priority of goals needed?

It arises from a concern that conflicts with many of the views expressed in both the Report and by our group of contributors. It strikes at the heart of conflict between schools and society. Most of the goals in the Report are affective, humanistic, and process-oriented. Our contributors did not argue against "motherhood." Who are we to deny that schools should be humane, emphasize the personal-social concerns of children and youth, and provide for growth in values, attitudes, character, and personalities? Are we against racial integration, busing, and financing for equalizing social opportunities? Of course not! As a matter of fact if lives are lost on highways, should not schools provide for driver training? If the homes, in our opinion, fail to provide for adequate sex education, should not the school do so? If any and all societal functions fail, in our opinion, should not the school take on all such functions? The real answer is that the schools cannot do it all. They have not even found ways to reach a sufficient number of children to prevent inadequate readers from leaving school with high school diplomas.

Don't we know, in all honesty, that the schools are being saddled with solving the racial integration problem through busing because people are not free to live or be housed in integrated areas? Society's problem is being foisted on schools and the school solution has not worked because of the society. Is it not time to bury the assumption that schools can successfully be all things to all people and solve all societal problems that are so *willingly* thrust upon them? Teachers, administrators, and education professors have been selling this assumption too long. It is time for some group (perhaps teacher unions can and will do it) to inform the public that we cannot do it all, certainly cannot do it all well, and we need a realistic priority of goals for children and schools.

The Commission has provided us with percentage responses to 13 goals statements from administrators, teachers, parents and students. The importance attached to each goal is noted, in descending order, from "essential" to "not chiefly the responsibility of the school." In reproducing the data below, only the "essential" category will be used. A second decision has to do with which group should be primary in determining goal priorities, and it is resolved by noting that parental judgments should be. (They should decide why their children attend an institution.) However, it also makes sense to provide for a check on goal-setting, and the decision is made here to utilize teacher judgments for this purpose. In effect, where teachers disagree with parents, we will temper the parental judgment.

Parental and Teacher Goal Priorities

Goal Statement	Essential to Parents	Essential to Teachers	Parental Priority	Extent of Agreement
Respect for Law and Authority	75.0	61.0	High	No
Clarification of Values	62.0	70.1	Moderate	Yes
Adjustment to Change	57.1	59.3	Low	Yes
Nature and Environment	42.9	47.5	Low	Yes
Appreciation of Others	57.1	69.5	Low	No
Economic Understanding	48.6	38.4	Low	Yes
Communication Skills	92.9	90.4	High	Yes
Knowledge of Self	70.0	82.0	Moderate	No
Responsibility for Citizenship	82.0	76.3	High	Yes
Critical Thinking	89.3	83.6	High	Yes
Occupational Competency	69.3	48.6	Moderate	No
Computation Skills	68.6	68.6	Moderate	Yes
Achievements of Man	42.0	47.5	Low	Yes

To interpret the data and its analysis, the reader needs to know how the writer arrived at the two columns at the right. Note from the table that the parents provided for a cluster of four goals with high percentages. The second cluster is noted as moderate; the third as low. By examining teacher ranking and percentages, it became fairly obvious where the two groups were agreeing and disagreeing. The line of demarcation may not be sharp in every instance, but is obvious to the point where differing interpretations are unlikely.

In a national sense, note that the highest priorities of parents that are also supported by teachers are given to the three goals of Communication Skills, Critical Thinking, and Responsibility for Citizenship. There might be a tendency to state, as a result, that all schools should therefore stress these goals above all others. However, there is a fallacy in this conclusion. How do we know that this priority agreement would exist in all school-communities or in any given one? This may be likely, but it is not necessarily true. For example, is it not likely that Occupational Competency, which is of moderately high priority with parents, and low priority with teachers, would rank higher than the national norm in an economically depressed area? Similarly, is it not likely that Achievements of Man, which reflects the cultural heritage, would rank higher in a geographical area that reflects a highly intellectual community?

These statements are not meant to imply that we should disregard the priorities that can be gleaned from the data. They are meant to serve as a caution against overgeneralizing and to give credence to the concerns referred to above in the chapters by Cutler, Komisar, and Watson. Indeed, while it may be wise to seek a balance between national or societal goals, on one hand, and individual or idiosyncratic goals, on the other, a national report is likely to stress priority in the national direction. On the other hand, we can take some assurance from the recommendation that national policy should determine goals, because local school districts, if they can maintain their traditional autonomy, will not permit the national policy to prevail at the expense of the individual and communities.

Another way of viewing the priorities is to examine them in the context of the times. A decade ago, it is likely that Achievements of Man and Computational Skills would have been higher. It is also likely that Respect for Authority, currently high with parents, would have been lower in priority. This is an age when the public is highly concerned about law and order.

How Do the Goals Relate to the Curriculum Recommendations?

The major criticism of the goals is the relationship (or rather lack of it) to the curriculum recommendations. Their reader is left to surmise how the 13 goals necessarily lead to the 32 recommendations, or, in reverse, how the recommendations stem from the goals. The same goals could well lead to different recommendations. The same recommendations might stem from different goals. Why is the reader cheated of the opportunity to see the translation or rationale of this thought process?

For example, we may presume that the goal of Acquisition of Occupational Competence justifies Recommendations 8-10 of the Report. These deal with Expanding Career Opportunities, Career Education, and Job Placement. Why then does the goal Knowledge of Self not lead to any recommendations about today's drug problem that seriously affects students both in and out of school? One might argue this point both in terms of the logic above (relating goals to recommendations) and also in terms of the recommendation to control

violence, which affects the conditions for learning.

How Sound Are the Recommendations?

Recommendation 3 (The Basis for Curricular Revision) calls for lessening content that results from competing interests of high school staffs and college requirements. Instead, the call is to provide content that meets the needs of students. So what is new? It is difficult to argue against this until we begin to examine what needs we are talking about and what this all really means. The assumption is that we should stop being arbitrary about history, mathematics, etc., as necessary content for all. All right then. What should it be? What needs are we trying to meet? The Commission never tackles the issue of intellectual vs. social-emotional vs. physical vs. moral needs. Or do they imply by failure to deal with the question that schools should be able to deal with all needs that range from academic to therapeutic?

Further attention to Recommendation 3 requires examining its relationship to explanations and expansions of the recommendation (pp. 44-45), and a dissent from a commission member (p. 171). The recommendation statement is: "Intelligent evaluation of curricular revision must grow from valid measurements of the degree to which students are achieving the stated goals and objectives of their school." This leads to a discussion (p. 44) on the need for performance-based instruction (with all of its implications for determining and developing curriculum, providing for instruction, and evaluating for efficiency and accountability). In the light of this, we call attention to Stanavage's insightful dissent (p. 171) where he reveals concern for the Report's failure to state the limitation of performance-based instruction. He notes that it often results in trivialization of learning. Education is more than conditioning and runs the risk of forfeiting fundamental goals in the effort to devise easily obtainable objectives.

While agreeing with these concerns, and yet applauding the value of moving toward *some* efficiency, *some* accountability, and *some* use of performance-based instruction, it is important to maintain perspective. The efficiency-learning movement has demonstrated some effectiveness in the areas of basic or fundamental skills and objectives at lower ends of the cognitive scale.[1] This represents about half the content goals and their implied curriculum. In terms of the Report's process goals, there is a little or no evidence that the performance-based approach can help realize them. There is even more reason to think that it may help defeat them.[2] On what basis can the proponents of the performance-based movement advocate achieving, let alone measuring, affective goals through the use of efficiency modes?

A national report, designed to influence all our secondary schools, seems wise to advocate increasing efficiency in learning; but it should not go unchallenged when it fails to recognize limitations in a major recommendation that runs the risk of excesses. Such excesses can lead to a return to the corporate-like curriculum of the 1920s.[3] The heart of the matter is revealed when we examine Recommendation 12 (Alternative Paths to High School Completion) by itself and in relation to Recommendation 3, referred to above.

At first glance, one is ready to applaud the notion that "individual students must be encouraged to assume major responsibility for the

determination of their educational goals, the development of the learning activities needed to achieve those goals, and the appraisal of their progress." It is difficult to oppose helping students become independent and free of adult prescriptions for them. But do we mean it? Do we really expect youth to take the *major* responsibility to develop learning activities? Not really. Nor do the youth, themselves, expect this.

Not only does the Commission fall into this trap, but so does Minuchin (Chapter 7). The trap is part of the current norm of permissiveness that has caused many failures in the open classroom and the open campus. Our youth seem to be telling us that they cannot handle all the freedom and responsibility we thrust upon them. They expect us to be more consistently concerned with our expectations of them, but the educational community does not appear to be listening.

Komisar (Chapter 4) picks up the inconsistency in recommendations 3 and 12 when he notes that the public and youth are to be made aware of the 13 goals and, at another point, they are to pursue their own objectives. The document contains four pages regretting the decline of foreign language study in high schools (pp. 66-70). Not only is no solution provided for resolving the issue raised, but one might also note the potential inconsistency in this regret with the call noted above. (This is in relation to Recommendation 11 on global education.)

Of all the curriculum recommendations, 8-10 (those on career education) seem to have the best rationale. It seems high time to secure the cooperation of industry and labor to return to past features of an apprentice system. Helping youth discover about and develop saleable skills has been considered too much of a school function for too long. Skill development must be shared with other agencies.

What Recommendations Might Have Been Made?

The criticism was made above that we were unfortunate not to be shown how the recommendations related to the goals. To be more positively critical, it may pay to show how another set of recommendations could have evolved from the same rhetoric. This results in a proposal for five types of programs: (a) *fundamental skills*, (b) *personal-social*, (c) *disciplinary*, (d) *survival-interdisciplinary*, and (e) *extra-mural*.

(a) *The fundamental skill program* recognizes that many youth in high school are weak in both communication and computational skills and can profit from laboratories that utilize performance-based instruction. Only those diagnosed as needing this service would get it.

(b) *The personal-social program* consists of group guidance seminars that deal with personal concerns of youth and the affective and some process-oriented goals noted by the Commission. It is designed for relevance to youth.

(c) *The disciplinary program* is general education in the customary cognitive cultural heritage areas of study. It is limited to those who are either low in fundamental skills or to those who desire early vocational preparation. It is not a relevant program to students because adults prescribe it.

(d) *The survival-interdisciplinary program* is a series of mini-course electives that students and faculty determine. It cuts across subject lines and is designed for relevance to youth.

(e) *The extra-mural program* uses settings other than the school for work experience, volunteer work, home study, or travel. Learning about careers fits under survival. Trying one's wings in a job or apprenticeship fits under the extra-mural program.

In such programs, performance-based instruction is restricted to the lower cognitive areas where it has

demonstrated itself to be effective. The above program areas allow for efficient training as well as a broader education and specify which is where and for whom.

The Commission would have been wise to have faced the issue of the secondary school introducing new, non-cognitive programs into its setting as opposed to another trend of using newer organizational arrangements outside of school for its program. The five program areas noted above allow both. If faced with the necessity to lean toward school or out-of-school settings, it would seem wiser to do the latter. Using extra-mural settings and cooperating with other agencies for education is required if the school is to use the wider world for benefits to its program and lessen its custodial function.

What Is the Major Goal and Policy Issue?

Earlier reference was made to the issue of individual versus society (or the common good). In curricular terms, the issue is commonality versus diversity. The Report does not really tackle this major issue. Although it pays lip service to the individual, it leans toward societal concerns and commonality with adherence to performance criteria for students and teachers. The five suggested program areas described above would seem to provide the needed balance in terms of commonality and diversity. However, the point does not lie here. Rather it lies in recognizing the need for policy formation on curriculum after a clarification of the major issue.

Other policy questions about curriculum require scrutiny today. To what extent should a curriculum be geared to immediate relevance to youth as opposed to adult expectations? To what extent should the cultural heritage, as reflected in the college disciplines, be expected learning for high school youth? By addressing themselves to such questions, this and other Commissions may be prevented from contradicting themselves (for example, prescribing goals students must seek to achieve while they are at the same time responsible for setting goals for themselves); and we may yet begin to see educational (and curriculum) policy set forth for all to see and weigh. By not tackling such questions, policies are arrived at implicitly, without an adequate and disciplined rationale.

References

1. Bloom, Benjamin (ed.) **Taxonomy of Educational Objectives: Handbook I: Cognitive Domain**, New York: David McKay Co., 1956.

2. Alpren, Morton and Baron, Bruce, "Death of the Behavioral Objectives Movement," **Intellect**, November, 1974.

3. Kliebard, Herbert, "Bureaucracy and Curriculum Theory," in **Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling**, ASCD Yearbook, Washington, D.C., 1971.

ADOLESCENT DEVELOPMENT: SOME IMPLICATIONS AND RELEVANT ISSUES FOR REFORM

Patricia Minuchin

This discussion will approach the Report along two main avenues, the first a general survey of adolescent challenges and characteristics; the second more directly related to the specific recommendations of the Report: (A) *Adolescent Development: Some Implications of the Report;* and (B) *Adolescent Development: Relevant Issues Related to Specific Recommendations of the Report.*

Adolescent Development: Some Implications of the Report

Developmental psychologists interested in adolescence usually identify a core of salient issues that challenge the adolescent as part of normal development, and a set of basic characteristics that describe young people at this stage. These issues and characteristics might be summarized under the following subheadings, though clearly they are interrelated: (1) *The Development of a Career Choice and a Mature Role in Society;* (2) *The Search for Identity and a System of Values;* (3) *The Establishment of Increasing Independence, and of New Forms of Relationships to Adults and Peers;* (4) *The Growth of Intellectual Power;* (5) *The Variability Among Individuals* and *Among Substages of Adolescence.*

A Yale Ph.D., Patricia Minuchin is Professor of Psychoeducational Processes in the Temple University College of Education.

The Development of a Career Choice and a Mature Role in Society

As the adolescent grows, approaching maturity in body form and strength, sexuality, intellectual power and scope of interest, he or she inevitably turns to the future searching for a vocational direction and a niche in society. This is a complex process, involving an attempt to match what one knows about oneself with the available possibilities, an exploration of alternatives in fantasy or reality, and the pursuit of relevant training as tentative or firm choices are made. The exploration of roles involves also a conceptual and emotional shift, as the adolescent strives to become a responsible, productive person who must manage life actively and handle the dependence of others on oneself.

Such a challenge for the adolescent implies several things for a society and an educational system attempting to support healthy growth. Obviously it implies wide opportunity to explore possibilities, at least partly in real situations. At the same time, the adolescent search implies a period of "moratorium" (Erikson, 1968), during which there is leeway to change, try different avenues, and hold open definite commitments until experience and certainty indicate a firm direction. The exploration of a mature role implies other opportunities that may take place in a variety of settings, including the school, work, family, youth groups, etc. In a recent report, Coleman (1974) has pointed up the need to allow young people the opportunity for responsible roles—to be in charge of younger children, to function in group situations where others depend on their efforts, to direct more aspects of their own lives, and to make choices that carry real and meaningful consequences. It is important that such opportunities should be supervised, but the view of adolescents as trying on mature roles suggests that such possibilities must exist.

The Search for Identity and a System of Values

In a sense, this is a broader statement of the first point above, implying a general search for self-knowledge and a sense of personal identity. Erik Erikson, the primary exponent of this view of adolescence (1950, 1968), has stressed the adolescent's need to sift his or her past identifications and to make them consistent with future plans and goals. The adolescent searches for a value system to believe in and support, for meaningful people who fit his or her new conceptions, for forms of controlling and expressing sexuality and intense feeling, and for a general sense of how one can fit into society or create meaningful changes that better fit one's values. At best, this process involves time and periods of disequilibrium. The danger, as Erikson describes it, lies in an excessively prolonged period of "role diffusion."

Such a process implies, again, the need for wide opportunities to explore, provided and partly supervised by society and/or the school system. It implies opportunity for active contact and shared experience with peers and with adult guides (see the following subsection) and the availability of trained adult help for what may be overwhelming problems at points. It also suggests that some of the form and content of educational experience should approach directly the issues that concern adolescents: value clarification; discussions of roles, feelings, life directions and societal change; and guided experiences that highlight and process the nature of affective and interpersonal relations.

The Establishment of Increasing Independence and New Forms of Relationships to Adults and Peers

Adolescence brings with it a push toward increasing autonomy from family, adults and the older generation. This is a necessary development, even though it often takes exaggerated, erratic forms, difficult for adults to handle and adapt to. The adolescent must make some unique amalgamation of the qualities and values he or she has lived with in the family and the array of experiences and viewpoints that characterize the current social context. To do this, he or she must separate particularly from the family adults who have been most influential. At the same time, the peer group, increasingly important through the elementary years, becomes a crucial reference group, important for the establishment of new values, for shared experiences, for the exploration of intimacy, and for the sense of belonging and attachment necessary to people of all ages.

The implications for interpersonal structures and relationships in educational settings for adolescents are complex. It seems clear that there must be considerable opportunity for peer contact and interaction. Adolescents seek this informally for themselves, but educational settings have particular opportunities to foster responsible peer working groups, peer exchange on vital social issues related to curriculum content, peer group processing of work experience and personal issues, etc.

The role of adult teachers (or others who directly supervise work or extra curricular experience) is particularly complex. In terms of the adolescent's needs, the adult must offer a model of competent adult functioning, provide specifically useful skills, ideas, and information, and convey the general sense of an available, understanding resource person, without defeating the adolescent's drive for autonomy or encroaching on legitimate peer group territory. Such writers as Bronfenbrenner (1970) and Coleman (1961, 1974) have been concerned with the increasing alienation between adults and young people in current society. They see adolescents as increasingly cut off from meaningful

contact with adults and increasingly involved with an isolated, self-sufficient and powerful "adolescent society," which feels alienated from other age groups and which controls the values, ideals and styles of its own members. Whether or not this is an accurate view, it seems clear that the roles and relationships of adult teachers to young people, during periods of individual and social change, require careful thought, considerable sensitivity and talent, and the provision of training and ongoing support from the educational structure.

The Growth of Intellectual Power

All the accumulating research on children's intelligence (see Piaget and others) tells us that the early adolescent years are the transition point to mature forms of thought. The adolescent becomes increasingly able to process information, deal with abstractions, generate hypothetical structures, and follow complex ideas to logical conclusions and implications. The fact that the adolescent is capable of complex thinking is certainly no guarantee that he or she will direct energy toward assigned tasks. The issue of what it takes to mobilize this potential power is crucial.

The implications for an educational system are obvious. Both the curriculum content and the form of educational exchange (whether in school settings or outside) need to mobilize adolescent interest and energy. Where the materials and experience of education appear relevant, valuable or interesting to the young, then presumably, the adolescent power to understand, probe and expand could be an available and productive tool for desirable maturation and development. Where these materials and experiences do not appear relevant to the young, then settings outside of school may provide better means to these ends.

The Variability Among Individuals and Among Substages of Adolescence

Every commentator on adolescence stresses the variability of this state in two senses: the great variability among individuals in rate of growth, style, subjective stress and coping mechanisms; and the existence of substages, with shifting adaptations from year to year within the span identified as "adolescence."

The clearest material on individual variation comes from biological data. Children reach puberty, go through growth spurts and secondary changes, and attain full body growth over a period of several years. Some children begin this process as early as 10 or 11, while others show significant changes as late as 16 or 17. Psychological differences associated with "early" and "late" maturing have been extensively studied. (Julius and Mussen, 1958; Mussen and Jones, 1957; Weatherly, 1964) and show patterns of self-image, peer leadership, perceived attractiveness, etc., associated with the rate of biological change. Maturation for males and females is different: girls tend to reach puberty and show secondary changes in height, body form, voice, etc. significantly earlier than boys, but boys surpass girls in strength and height toward middle and late adolescence. The psychological patterns associated with early and late maturing are different for boys and girls, and change, also, as society's attitudes toward sexuality and sex-roles change. Beyond these visible variations in physical maturity are the many individual variations in less tangible aspects. Individuals differ in their subjective sense of equilibrium or confusion through this period, in the degree to which self-image changes, in the way they incorporate relationships with peers and adults into their

capacity to function adaptively in school or at home during periods of turmoil and uncertainty. Various aspects of growth are also uneven ("poorly correlated," in research terms), so that people may spurt ahead intellectually, though physical growth is slow and interpersonal relationships uncertain, or vice versa. Each individual has his or her own pattern.

For the adolescent population at large, there are substages within the 13-19 year age span. These are variously described by different investigators, but always include a pattern of shift from periods of stress and disorganization centered on various issues. For Elkind (1973), a developmental psychologist, thirteen year olds tend to show the restlessness and confusion associated with body changes and their implications. Fourteen year olds make some peace with this and are more tranquil and organized, but fifteen year olds are again touchy, critical and off-base, fighting excessively for independence, withdrawing from adults and facing the problems of social growth with anxiety. Sixteen year olds may be, again, more relaxed and focused, etc. While this sequence is surely a simplification, it suggests a pattern that does not simply go from lesser to greater maturity but is likely to show a recurrent ebb and flow of energy, commitment and organization.

Implications involve the orientation of adults, who must relate helpfully to inconsistent and variable behavior; they also involve the attitudes of the school system and community toward the opportunities they provide. All must allow for and guide a wide diversity of reactions among the young, and a possibly erratic quality to decisions, explorations and commitments made during this period. Again, there is some balance required between provision for opportunity and commitment, on the one hand, and the acceptance of "moratorium" and change, on the other.

Adolescent Development: Relevant Issues in the Report

From the point of view of adolescent development, a number of issues can be raised about the recommendations and coverage of the Report; they may appropriately be discussed under the following subheadings, all related to various recommendations:* (1) *The Conceptualization of Alternative Pathways* (Recommendations 8, 9, 12, 14, 19); (2) *Decision-making and Responsibility in Early Adolescence* (Recommendations 12, 23, 27, 28, 30); (3) *The Role of Adults* (Recommendations 4, 6); (4) *Curriculum Content and Process in School* (Recommendations 3, 11); (5) *Evaluation and Certification: The Paradox of Divergent Goals and Convergent Criteria* (Recommendations 1, 3, 14, 15, 20).

The Conceptualization of Alternative Pathways (Recommendations 8, 9, 12, 14, 19)

There is a central theme in the Report concerning wider opportunities for high school youth to explore and enter the world of work, and a much wider provision of pathways toward education, training and maturity. In terms of the capacities and needs already dealt with (the need to explore; the importance of contact with adults, real issues and responsible roles; the wide variability among individuals, etc.) this is a valid and important direction. Choice and experience per se, however, are not sufficient, and it is probably important to develop other aspects of the discussion more fully. Without certain

*These recommendations are generally rather than specifically related to the issue raised, in most cases. Issues may also involve problems of depth or coverage, not referrable to specific recommendations.

supports a valid suggestion is a potential boomerang, capable of creating damage and new problems.

The provision of wider opportunities would need to be supported in such ways as: (a) *Structure and guidance in the choices offered*; (b) *Provision for processing work experiences with peers and adults*; (c) *Leeway for change*; (d) *Careful community organization*.

(a) *Structure and guidance in the choices offered*. Choices available to students, either for work opportunities or as alternative forms of study, would need to be carefully selected and presented to students in some coherent way, with help and supervision in the choices. This probably involves a cadre of responsible personnel, attached to the school system, who can select, organize and monitor the array of institutions and opportunities available and the process of choice.

(b) *Provision for processing work experiences with peers and adults*. Experience in work settings can be both valuable and confusing. If such experiences are to be optimal, adolescents need to discuss and evaluate their experience as it occurs. One possible forum would be small ongoing discussion groups of students, who come together at intervals in the school setting, with a knowledgeable adult as guide to discuss and process their external experiences.

(c) *Leeway for change*. In keeping with the changing nature of adolescents and the necessary moratorium aspects of this period, there should be provision for changing decisions and commitments in relation to selected work experiences and educational pathways. Adult guidance is essential here, to prevent chaotic patterns and to facilitate the changes that come from experience and growth.

(d) *Careful community organization*. The movement of youth into work situations is fraught with potential complications and requires careful coordination with the community to prevent destructive experiences for the adolescents. Beyond the problems that are always present, a society in turmoil and economic crisis presents special problems. When unemployment is high, an influx of young workers as apprentices is an obvious threat; if society is polarized on basic issues and there are active protest movements, the mixture of older workers and adolescents is potentially tense. An educational system and a community that move toward community work experience for youth need to deal with the larger social and economic structure of the country, anticipating problems and altering both the nature of alternatives offered and the support systems provided for adolescents in terms of these realities.

Decision-making and Responsibility in Early Adolescence (Recommendations 12, 23, 27, 28, 30)

The opportunities for decision-making suggested in the Report are double-edged. They offer considerable opportunity for choice but, at the same time, they create the potential for burnt bridges and heavy burdens that may not work to the advantage of the students.

The most obvious example is the 14 year old level suggested for possible school-leaving and for crucial decisions about alternative pathways. This is a young age for that kind of choice. Children this age simply do not know enough about themselves, the world of work, or the mechanisms by which one tries to look at the future and one's own role. One psychologist (Eichorn 1974) has pointed out that many aspects of life-style follow from vocational choice, and young adolescents can neither make such decisions maturely nor can they be hurried. Even the fact that 14 year olds

may feel confident and enthusiastic about their choices does not guarantee that they will not be tackling new problems, looking at the world quite differently, and feeling new uncertainties a year later. Most theorists and policy makers see this kind of choice properly coming no earlier than 16. Among contributors to the Report, in fact, there were clear dissenters on this issue, Risinger abstaining from this recommendation (see p. 169) and Mayer pointing out his general concern for the decision-making burdens placed on insufficiently equipped adolescents (p. 168).

It might also be pointed out that certain groups among the young face a world of changing opportunities. Women, blacks and other transitional or minority groups are obvious examples. They may especially need time and guidance to explore, understand their new possibilities, and handle the anxiety of trying new avenues against a background of traditional concepts they may have internalized themselves and can certainly expect to meet, still, in the wider culture. Such groups of young people are not well served by making far-reaching decisions at age 14.

Some aspects of decision-making and active participation are, of course, positive and essential, if they are well supported. Some deserve more elaboration and discussion than the report gives them. Among these are the following: opportunity for wider choice in the selection of courses, electives and learning experiences within the school; active participation and parity in designing the rules by which the school will function; a variety of realistic roles through which responsibility for others can be carried and explored (tutoring, school government, inter-age groupings involving contact with older and younger children, group collaboration on learning content and products); and a reorganization of classroom structures in ways that allow more active roles for students, and a conception of adult authority that is functional rather than automatic or arbitrary.

The Role of Adults (Recommendations 4, 6)

Matthew Bruce in Chapter 5 of this volume deals with teacher training. Even without a reorganization of secondary education, the role of teaching and supervisory adults for adolescents probably requires a broader definition than is traditional and a more sophisticated system of training and ongoing support for teachers. In addition, the Report points out that widened opportunities and settings will require a broader array of skills and roles for adult teachers, especially for young teachers who will be coming into a reduced job market and filling some of the newly developing positions.

Other responses in this volume will deal with teacher training. From the viewpoint of adolescent needs and development, however, it might be useful to point out that adolescents need a variety of things from non-family adults in education-oriented positions. They need adults who understand their roles as models and guides for the young in the total process of personal development. This implies a self-image for teachers that moves beyond a subject and authority-centered conception of teaching. Adolescents also need guidance from adults in exploring themselves and society, and in processing their experiences in and out of school. Sometimes they need more organized counseling. Identity issues can get in the way of everything else, and the potential for confusion is especially strong in a complex society which calls for personal cohesion when it is itself fragmented and chaotic. Teachers need a preparatory training that orients them toward a broad role definition, specific preparation for

guidance roles, and a structure for continuing, on-the-job discussion, planning and support. Such issues are not thoroughly dealt with in the Report.

Curriculum Content and Process in School (Recommendations 3, 11)

Morton Alpren, in Chapter 6, deals with Curriculum in greater detail. Perhaps it is worth noting, however, that the Report does not deal in depth with advisable changes in the learning environment and curriculum, considering the high intellectual potential of adolescents and the obvious fact that this is often not mobilized or developed by the school.

One theme deserving support and development is the shift from rote mastery of subject matter, often considered "irrelevant" by adolescents, to a greater stress on problem-oriented material, in which students are helped to generate the meaningful issues, and then to apply their capacity to gather, process and evaluate information systematically toward the generation of solutions and the discussion of their implications.

The Report's suggestions on global and ecologically-oriented education seem interesting and important, potentially capable of mobilizing adolescent interest in the society they must deal with and adolescent commitment to causes they believe in. As always, the major issue is how such material is developed and presented. One commission member (Mendenhall, p. 170) effectively points out the realities and difficulties surrounding such a recommendation. One would tend to support his point, noting that the direction is worthy but that it needs a well-worked out structure for providing materials and for training teachers to deal with material through processes meaningful to adolescents.

Evaluation and Certification: The Paradox of Divergent Goals and Convergent Criteria (Recommendations 1, 3, 14, 15, 20)

The goals of secondary education, as presented in the Report, are broad. They provide not only for "convergent" goals (e.g., certain levels of intellectual mastery) but for "divergent" goals involving personal growth and individualized learning. Wherever the Report approaches issues of evaluation or certification, however, it tends to stress standardized approaches. It deals with specific and measurable objectives, performance-based instruction, and criterion-referenced evaluation. John Stavanage, a commission member registers his concern for the possible forfeit of fundamental goals through efforts to devise specific, easily obtainable and measurable objectives. (p. 171).

Some of the Commission's reasoning in their Report is understandable. They are trying to provide alternative pathways for education while devising some means of crediting and certifying these experiences for later college admission, job employment, and other social realities. There is no simple, obvious, clear-cut way to solve the problem. It seems advisable to acknowledge and describe it as a problem, as we have done, while at the same time avoiding the paradoxical imposition of common-denominator objectives and evaluation on efforts to provide for the diversity of adolescent growth and goals.

INSTRUCTIONAL MEDIA AND REFORM

William F. Grady

Summary and Forecast

The concerns dealt with here are generally presented in part IV of the Report, "Alternatives to Traditional Secondary Education," and more specifically in Chapter 8, "The Impact of Television on Curriculum Content."

The Report presents three recommendations (16, 17, 18) which this author considers extremely useful. It is clear that the Report is favorably disposed, based on the results of current research, toward the use of television in teaching at the secondary educational level. However, television is only one of a wide variety of media available; it is only when the whole spectrum of media resources is considered, that their real potential can be fully envisioned. There is no doubt that more and better-designed research is needed in a variety of areas related to instructional media.

Thus, while the Report is to be applauded in general, it has a major weakness in failing to recognize the potentialities for reform provided by educational media other than television. The extensive use in a variety of educational settings of all forms of media, including television—if they were developed according to research to be suggested here, *and* managed by technologically sophisticated teachers, educational media personnel, and students—could in itself constitute a major reform in secondary education, indeed in education for all ages and levels.

William F. Grady, University of Arkansas, Ed.D., is Chairman and Professor, Division of Educational Communications, Temple University College of Education.

The remainder of this presentation appears under three main headings: (A) *Historical Perspective;* (B) *The Emerging Roles of Teachers and Schools;* and (C) *A Brief Summary of Recent Research.*

Historical Perspective

The early systems of formal education were generally teacher-centered. That is, the teacher possessed all the knowledge considered necessary and desirable and conveyed this knowledge to the pupils under his charge. These pupils were usually the children of the wealthy; of course the teacher-pupil ratio was very low. A one-to-one ratio was not uncommon, and the teacher often "lived-in" with the family. In order to focus the remainder of the discussion, it will be helpful to examine briefly certain undesirable aspects of education that persist in spite of available instructional technology.

As social and economic changes occurred, teachers accepted more students and required special places to teach—schools. And the teacher still was viewed as the only person with the capability of educating others. As information increased and students' backgrounds became more diversified, teachers at the secondary level "specialized" in specific subjects, and to some extent even in specific ability levels. Indeed, to this day teachers and schools are viewed as *the* centers of knowledge. It is not news that children from about age 6 to 16 or 17 attend school only at specific times *to be educated by teachers.* Today's public and private secondary level educational systems can be described as *time-locked, space-locked,* and *age-locked.* They are *time-locked* in that students are required to receive formal instruction, typically from about 8:30 a.m. until 2:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, September through May. And within this block of time further *time-locked*

instruction is administered by teachers presenting information concerning various subjects according to a rigid daily schedule (e.g., 8:30-9:15 Algebra I, 9:20 - 10:05 English Literature, etc.).

Education is *space-locked* in that a student must come to a school building to sit in classrooms in order to receive his education, often after riding a long distance on a school bus. The content to be learned is not usually available to students in a formal, organized manner outside classrooms. With very few exceptions, educational television and computer programs are now available *only* in the school setting and in a limited number of schools at that.

The *age-locked* system is inherent in the requirement that all children, generally from about the age of 6 to 16 or 17, attend school. The system is further *age-locked* by assigning different levels of subject content to predetermined groups of students. The student's membership in a particular group depends more on his birthdate and current age than on any other single factor, individual differences, interests, mental ability, or intelligence notwithstanding. Only recently at the secondary level have sporadic attempts been made to break down this age-locked system. These attempts include specially accelerated programs, feeble attempts at individualized instruction, modular scheduling, expanded electives and some use of modern instructional technology.

But with modern technology potentially available for educational purposes, secondary students need not remain bound to the teacher-centered school for their entire education. Education, knowledge, information, and instruction in skills are available from a wide variety of sources; often these sources can be more readily and economically available than in school settings. Consequently, secondary students may come to school having already acquired more and more the basic knowledge that they formerly could acquire only in school; consider, for example, the effect on early primary grades of recent television programs designed for that age group. This earlier and perhaps less formal acquisition of experience and information will have to bring about a change in the role of the teacher and the school. And formal education will have to take on considerably different characteristics.

The Emerging Roles of Teachers and Schools

School teachers traditionally have directed most of their efforts to teaching the "whats" and the "when" of some mutually agreed-upon body of knowledge. This formal process typically continues to fill the major part of every school day; it leaves little time (except in classes with a majority of intellectually gifted students) for explaining the "whys" and "hows" related to subjects. Instructional packages delivered by modern technology should assume the perhaps burdensome chore of repetition, direct presentation of information, and thus offer the teacher an opportunity to be more effective in working with students in other ways, helping them to deal with the "whys" and "hows." Increased sophistication in the design and production of instructional packages provides new dimensions for students in their efforts to assimulate and understand "how" and "why."

In contrast to the current *time-locked, space-locked, age-locked* system of education, educational technology will allow great flexibility in providing genuinely individualized learning experiences. No longer should students have to be locked into a schedule of 8:30 - 2:30 Monday through Friday, September through May. Students will not be required to observe rigid time-space

schedules in school buildings as they are now. Their education can be made available at almost any time or place they desire to experience it. Modern technology, in addition to portable printed information, provides audio and video information in portable formats. Lightweight battery-operated units require no outside power source and can easily be taken wherever the student chooses and used whenever he wants to have a program presented to him. A further advantage is the possibility of repeating the program at will.

With basic information and knowledge more readily available from sources other than the traditional teacher/school setting, schools and teachers, as their roles eventually will come to be defined, can be increasingly concerned with more relevant educational functions than presenting basic content. The teacher will become more a director or manager of learning activities than a purveyor of information. Of necessity, teachers must become more skillful in (1) diagnosing learning problems and disabilities, (2) formulating learning strategies designed to overcome learning problems, and (3) prescribing recommended learning activities. Schools will become more concerned with, and place greater emphasis, on activities that enhance the maturation and socialization of individual students. This direction will make education more humane and reduce the inhumanity of the current attempt to provide equal education for students of unequal ability and different interests. Modern technology for educational purposes can be designed to deliver an almost infinite array of educational programs produced for a virtually infinite variety of individual differences. There will be time for teachers to consider criteria other than age when general and specific learning strategies and educational activities are formulated. Learning materials designed for various mental ability levels and individual differences will be available to each student according to his individual needs. For example, a student with learning difficulties resulting from vocabulary deficiencies can have subject-matter instructional packages made available to him employing the vocabulary appropriate specifically for him. While a student's vocabulary may be deficient in one subject matter area, it may be above average in another. Modern instructional technology delivering well designed materials can accommodate such individual and group differences to an almost unimaginable degree.

As the teacher's role changes, so must the professional programs change that prepare teachers. Teacher preparation curricula must be developed which will provide instruction and experience in the design, development, production, utilization, and evaluation of teaching/learning packages that appropriately employ the capabilities of modern instructional technology.

Research also needs to be designed and conducted to determine whether the savings in time found in currently available studies using computer-assisted instruction can be shown to be significant over long periods of time and in a larger percentage of the total educational experience of a student. Studies investigating the role of instructional technology in lifelong education need to be conducted. With results from such research studies as these and new ones that can be developed, it will be possible to determine accurately the strengths and weaknesses of technological alternatives to the traditional secondary school.

A Brief Summary of Recent Research

Recommendation 16 of the Report suggests in part: ". . . support

extensive research into the influence of television on students' attitudes, perception, and life styles. The purposes of this research should be to suggest changes in school curricula and instructional approach." On the basis of this recommendation, it is appropriate now to discuss the current state of the art, relating it to research findings. The concluding paragraphs of this section suggest future research in instructional technology.

The conclusion that "Students learn effectively from all these media, and relatively few studies indicate a significant difference in one medium over another or of one variant of a medium over another" was reported by Jamison, Suppes, and Wells after an in-depth review of over 175 research reports investigating the effectiveness of traditional instruction (TI), instructional radio (IR), instructional television (ITV), programmed instruction (PI), and computer-assisted instruction (CAI). (Winter, 1974, quarterly of the **Review of Educational Research**). This means that the current educational offerings available via modern instructional technology are just as effective as traditional classroom instruction and therefore provide a viable alternative to current teacher-centered practices in secondary education. While the Report does suggest additional areas of study related to instructional technology, it is far from complete. If instructional technology is to have the impact that is possible upon education at all levels, other areas of study are essential. For example, a basic problem with most research relates to instructional technology has been the comparison of traditional instruction with varieties of instruction by educational media. This comparative research is limited. Developmental/action research is needed at this time in order to indicate *how* we can best utilize technology in a variety of learning environments, especially those found outside traditional school settings, and different from learning environments usually associated with traditional instruction.

Further research and study should be conducted related to the long-term effects of various technologies in motivating students at various educational levels and intellectual abilities. Long-term research projects investigating the effects of individualized and self-instruction need to be carried out. For example, do students who are given highly individualized programs in early elementary school prefer the continuation of such methods in upper elementary school, in secondary school, in college, in adult/continuing education? This is only one example of the kinds of research needed if we are to reform the teacher-centered school by means of an all-out effort to utilize educational media as an alternative.

CAREER EDUCATION AND REFORM

Janice Morehouse

Summary and Forecast

Career Education is a slogan that needs interpreting. We realized that career education was a slogan; we waited patiently for the Commission to interpret it; we read their proposal; critiqued it; and are left wondering "why?" For this, we must first look into the history of career education.

More than three years and 26 million dollars ago, the Nixon Administration became preoccupied with re-establishing the work ethic as a cornerstone of the American value system. Schools, often regarded as a panacea for social ills, were given the task. Career education was the result. Career education, therefore, was a politically inspired movement. It was born out of political motivation, and grew and prospered on federal money. It contained the promise of fulfilling the businessman's dream of making happy little workers out of unruly students. The Commission's proposal would fit perfectly into this picture. But is this what we want? Would their career education proposals serve young people as well as they would serve the political (business) establishment? The Commission gives various arguments for career education based on student need. But students need a variety of other knowledge and skills to get along in life. To have a successful and rewarding life, one needs health, friends, leisure time activities, values, academic skills such as reading and mathematics, knowledge of government, etc. Why place such total emphasis on the need for a career? It is true that having a job skill contributes to a person's emotional and psychological security, but so does physical attractiveness, a happy home life, popularity, etc. Yet schools do not concern themselves primarily with these things; why should they concern themselves so much with career education?

If one examines the Commission's proposal on career education closely, one notes subtle contradictions which exist between the career education program and the rest of the Report. Here are three:

1. The rest of the Report talks of the throes of social change, but its career education program ignores this relative to jobs and job skills.
2. The rest of the Report regards schools as being only one of the agencies socializing youth. Yet career education takes on the task of changing students' attitudes toward the differing status associated with different jobs.
3. The rest of the Report describes schools as too large and too much concerned with non-educational functions. Yet in its career education proposal, it would have the school serve as a job placement bureau.

On the basis of these facts, one must conclude that career education and the interpretation given to it by the Commission were motivated by other than educational reasons. This being so, it is now up to educators to decide whether there is anything about career education that is actually education rather than political indoctrination. In

---

A 1974 Temple Ed.D. in Philosophy of Education, Janice Morehouse is currently working for Research for Better Schools and teaching part-time at Temple University. This article was written while she was a doctoral candidate at Temple University; since then, the U.S.O.E. has distributed a position paper on career education and supported a series of conferences to inform teacher educators about the movement.

the final analysis, career education is still a slogan in search of an interpretation—one that is educational and not political.

The remainder of this discussion of career education is presented under three main headings: (A) *The Elusive Definition*; (B) *The Commission's Proposal*; (C) *Critique*.

The Elusive Definition

Career education is by definition education for a career. This circular statement tells us nothing; but it is the only point on which everyone agrees. Career education is called "the sequence of career development experiences . . . that prepare individuals for present and future career opportunities" (Iowa Model for Career Development). Likewise it is called "a vehicle for helping to prepare youth for productive careers."[1] It is also said that "career education is a vehicle that will permit every student to select a career based on his understanding of many available options."[2] But these noble, worthwhile goals do not define career education. These statements give us no information implied in the title career education coordinated with common sense. Certainly, no one would ever suggest that we should educate for *non-productive* or unavailable careers. After reading the above statements, we still know little about career education, what curriculum it entails, what philosophy it is based upon, what method it could or does use. And so on.

Another way of defining a term (other than saying what it is) is saying what it is *not*. Let us try out this technique on the literature to determine whether it produces any consensus. The question is "What type of education does career education rule out?" We often read that career education is education for the real world, but this rules out nothing; all education is for the "real world." All subjects have some use in the world, and, therefore, can be thought of as education for the "world." Religion, art, health, reading, etc., all can be thought of as being part of education for living in the world outside of school.

Many writers have stated that the main purpose of career education is to prepare students for successful and rewarding lives. But isn't this the purpose of *all* education? Mathematics, history, geography, biology have all been the basis for successful and rewarding lives. One cannot imagine an educational program designed and intended to prepare students for *unsuccessful* and *unrewarding* lives or educating them for an *unreal* world. Career education could be defined so that it would rule out education for academic excellence and/or education for self-fulfillment. But it has not been defined this way. "Career education includes a high emphasis on academic learning and on the liberal arts and on scholarship itself . . ."[3] Likewise, career education leads to—and does not rule out—self-fulfillment. An **NAASP Bulletin** states that career education is "a developmental process . . . which assists the individual in becoming aware of the relationship between his potentialities, aspirations, values, and how they can mature, in developing a sense of his own worth, purpose, and direction in life . . ."[4]

The only definitions one finds of career education apply to particular sets of circumstances. Some programs utilize the community as the teaching staff, others do not; some programs include college-bound students, others do not; some include traditional classroom subjects, others do not. Either the "definitions" are general and do not say anything, or they are too specific to include *all* career education programs. Therefore, there is actually *no* one definition of career education. In fact Sidney Marland admits this. In an interview he claimed, "Career education is much too large . . . to

permit a neat package of simple terms."[5]

The fact that the father of career education does not attempt to define it precisely makes one suspect that it is not definable. This is because career education is not a concept, but a slogan. Slogans are created to appeal to the feelings of the listener or reader. Career education appeals to us; it sound solid. No one could be against career education any more than he could be against "education for life adjustment," or "teaching pupils, not subjects" or "education for democracy." These are famous slogans from the educational past, and career education belongs with them. A slogan does not imply any particulars, but this in large measure accounts for a slogan's popularity. One can be for "education for excellence," *and* "education for democracy" *and* career education. And, being for all of the above does not require you to deny or oppose any specific program, method, or classroom organization.

Slogans are perfect for ceremonial use, but their vague definitions, the very source of their popularity, makes them meaningless. Thus slogans are useless for any precise function. Just as concepts must be defined, slogans must be interpreted. The interpretation of a slogan performs the same function as the definition of a concept. An interpretation, if comprehensive and appealing, often becomes the standard interpretation. This then acts as th `efinition of the slogan. If it is good enough, what the interpretation takes away from the slogan in flexibility it makes up for by increasing its practicability and usefulness. Many of the recent discussions of a career education can be seen as attempts to give it a standard interpretation; all have failed. It is with great anticipation that we turn to the Report's interpretation of career education.

The Commission's Proposal

Its proposal is divided into three phases. Phase one is a program in career awareness. Its objectives are to develop in all students an overview of various careers, respect for the work ethic, and an appreciation of the dignity of work. This is based upon the belief that our present society honors philosophers more than plumbers, and if this trend is not reversed, we may find that "neither its philosophy nor its pipes will hold water." Phase two is a program in exploration of careers. Occupations are divided into clusters, and students from grades 8 through 10 are to investigate "several occupations in each of a number of clusters." This the Commission claims will develop skills in students and teach them the information needed to make a career choice. The Commission suggests that different clusters be presented in different schools and students be transported to the "cluster" that interests them.

Phase three is a program for grades 11 and 12 which allows students to concentrate on the "acquisition of specific skills related to the occupation they have chosen." The goal is to give students access to training in any occupation carried on in the community served by the school. This would be accomplished by contracts in which businessmen undertake to develop specific competencies in students in return for fees paid by the schools. Career counselors would help students choose their field of concentration and would make sure that the occupations chosen are "in demand, important to society, and fulfilling for the individuals who choose them."

Critique

There is not much that is novel in this proposal. The literature already abounds with areas of criticism that can

quite aptly be applied to it. Three of these areas are summarized below: (1) *Obsolescence*; (2) *Naive and Unrealistic Beliefs*; and (3) *The Process of Making Career Choices*.

Obsolescence

A job that is in demand and important to society today may not be so ten years from now. We live in a rapidly changing society in which career choices and jobs cannot be once-in-a-lifetime decisions. In the future, as jobs and job skills become obsolete or in oversupply, it will become increasingly necessary for workers to move from one job to another and from one field to another. The unfortunate results or schools' not anticipating this trend and preparing students for it have already been shown. For example, from the 1950s through the middle 1960s, engineers were in great demand. The Drexel Institute of Technology promised the class of 1966 a bright, rosy future (if only they would apply themselves to their engineering course work). But the reunion this class held in 1970 brought together a group of disillusioned, bitter men. Defense contracts were being terminated, and many of these engineers found themselves unemployed and unemployable. Their rosy future had turned dark gray. The Commission uses watchmaking as an example of a skill to teach students (through contracting).[5] But will people want or need to have their watches repaired thirty years from now? Perhaps repair will be too expensive to be a practical alternative to buying a new watch, possibly a new and different kind of watch altogether. This is the dilemma that we find ourselves in when the soles of our shoes develop holes. Do we have our shoes mended or do we buy a new pair? More and more, people choose to buy new ones. This trend may change; we may stop becoming a "throw-away" society, but then again we may not. No counselor, however well informed and well intentioned, can assure a student that an occupation is always going to be in demand. A student, in order to live in a changing society, needs to have a broad background that is basic and applicable to different fields and different occupations rather than a specific job skill useful in a single occupation. At graduation a student needs to know how to go about finding a job rather than the promise of a specific job. Career education is supposed to be "real world" oriented, but the Commission's proposal is oriented only towards a dream world in which permanence of jobs and job skills can be guaranteed.

Naive and Unrealistic Beliefs

It is naive to assume that students need only good information to make sound and logical career choices. Many complex social and psychological factors enter into such decisions. These include parental pressure, self-esteem, friendships, and values. It is also naive to think that career education can teach respect for the work ethic and an appreciation of the dignity of work if these values are not held by adults. Career education is only a small part of a person's total school experience, and the total school experience is only a small part of his total life. Perhaps it is also naive to have students aim for jobs that are self-fulfilling. In today's society many jobs are dull, boring, and repetitive. One has to question whether the goals of the Commission's Career Education Program are sophisticated enough for today's students and today's society.

It is also unrealistic to believe that dignity and status are commodities that can be assigned to all jobs equally.

Kingdoms can be lost for want of a nail; society needs plumbers as much as philosophers or doctors. But need does not erase differences in social acceptance of certain kinds of work, nor change the high status of certain occupations. High status reflects values, not needs. We may need garbage collectors more than writers, but we do not award a Nobel prize in garbage collecting.

The Process of Making Career Choices

Research in vocational psychology has shown that the process of choosing a career is not a continuous one. Adolescents between thirteen and sixteen experience a period of confusion over their occupational preferences. At this age they become aware of new careers and different aspects of familiar careers. The Commission's career education proposal requires career choices precisely at the age when students appear to be least capable of making such decisions.

Their career education program also ignores the fact that vocational exploration goes on, for most people, into the early and middle twenties. Why attempt to cut off this exploration at sixteen, or even fourteen? The Commission points to the post-high-school dropout rate as "the strongest argument" in support of teaching marketable skills. But would the student of their proposed career education program be any better off if at twenty he decides that watchmaking is not for him? The student who drops out from a college teacher preparatory program may have no back-up position to turn to immediately. But does the career education student? In the eleventh or twelfth grade he would have chosen a career. It is true that he would have been made aware of alternative careers, something our college student may have missed. But this does not guarantee that the career education graduate might not, at twenty, change his mind. Because of his knowledge of alternatives, he might know better than the college dropout what he then wants to do but he would be just as unequipped to do it, as the college dropout. In fact, one might surmise that the college dropout who wanted to become a watchmaker would have an easier time becoming one than the watchmaker who wanted to become a teacher.

References

1. **Atlantic Journal and Constitution Magazine**, November 19, 1972, pp. 60-65.
2. **Phi Delta Kappan**, February, 1973, "Career Education: The First Steps Show Promise," Muirhead, pp. 370-372.
3. Marland, **American Education**, January—February, 1974, "An Interview with S.P. Marland, Jr." pp. 9-12.
4. March, 1973, pp. 62-72.
5. Op. cit.
6. The Report, p. 56.

EFFECTIVE RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REFORM

Frank X. Sutman

This chapter presents a basis for reform after due consideration of the Report and the nine previous chapters in this volume, and in the light of the author's long and intimate professional association with secondary education. Briefly presented are discussions of three main topics, with a view toward well-considered future actions lending to reform. These topics are subtitled: (A) *A Basis for Reform*; (B) *Criticism of the Rationale of the Report*; and (C) *Recommended Actions*.

A Basis for Reform

The Reform of Secondary Education is a serious report about a serious matter: the deterioration of the secondary schools in the United States. There is no doubt that the process of decay is an urgent problem. We can observe it in the lack of commitment by many administrators and teachers. Instead of schools, we see almost non-functional memorial palaces, or shabby deteriorating pock-marked structures, that would be overcrowded if all the students were in attendance at any one time. But these decayed buildings are half-hollow shells, because only half their population is present on any given day. We observe schools isolated from city or rural or suburban neighborhoods where students live, with little commitment to keep them attractive, functional, or even safe.

A Teachers College Columbia University Ed.D., Frank X. Sutman is Professor of Science Education and Chairman of the Secondary Education Department in the Temple University College of Education. He is also chairman of the committee that produced this volume.

Over the past fifty years guidance at the secondary level has become a specialty that could serve the young, yet too many counselors are former teachers who have taken refuge from teaching and from the classrooms where the action is and where it ought to be. Too often they move into guidance in order to abandon the rigors and the discipline of their academic fields. Too seldom are school people truly committed to guiding the youth of our country in both subject mastery and process or inquiry approaches to learning.

Once again the pendulum has swung very far from emphasis on content toward emphasis on process. So-called humanism, open-space education, and individualization are shallowly considered to be disciplines in themselves without reference to the subjects to be taught. Too many secondary teachers are earning graduate degrees in "process" as an end in itself, without applying process to a content area or a discipline. We have found it difficult to accept the need for balance between process (teaching skill) and content; this balance is especially necessary in a society that accepts mass education through the secondary level.

A major immediate effect of the lack of commitment by not only teachers but especially administrators is inflexibility in providing opportunities for learning. Concern over this inflexibility is referred to in many publications. The Preface of the recent Report of the panel on youth of the President's Science Advisory Committee: *Youth: Transition Into Adulthood*, states: As the labor of children has become unnecessary to society, the length of schooling has been extended for them. With every decade, the length of schooling has increased, until a thoughtful person must ask whether society can conceive of no other way for youth to come into adulthood.[1] This statement implies that schooling as we know it is an overly

rigid approach to education. In spite of the "alternative" movement, vocational experiences, the institution of mini courses, and other attempts to create flexibility, secondary education is essentially the same rigid process it was one, two, or three generations ago. For example, it is today virtually impossible to conduct a field trip which is a meaningful experience away from the traditional school building. Except for the relatively small number of students in vocational programs, off-campus experiences are virtually impossible.

Even with various signs of decay in our secondary schools, many positive signs of vibrant life should not be ignored. There still are a great many teachers who are able to motivate their students to learn. There *are* teachers who understand that values are better learned from examples set by themselves than through structured experiences in "values clarification." Each year thousands of students graduate from our secondary schools, who because of their school experiences *are* able to contribute in very positive ways to the vocational and business segments of society; others are quite adequately prepared to learn and to survive in some of the most prestigious colleges and universities.

Clearly the message is that if we are to deal effectively with the problems of secondary education in the United States we must not take a crisis stance. We must look at both the useful and the harmful aspects of secondary education; then we can take rational actions that will not destroy what already is working well. At the same time we must have the courage to eliminate features of the educational process that continue to spread decay. Too many local teachers' groups, boards of education, and institutions preparing teachers take the attitude that all is well in our secondary schools. Yet **The Reform of Secondary Education** presents an extreme opposite attitude: impotence, pending disaster, and crisis.

The Report takes the position that "the wave of criticism against the high schools has reached the point of overkill" (p. 3). This may be so, but the more productive part of the Report is their series of recommendations for action. While a number of the recommendations do not consider their consequences, they are presented for debate and consideration. The Report could move society in general, but more especially the educational community, from a position of *awareness* to a position of critical *action*. The next step is to examine the recommendations and to determine which warrant action and which do not. Yet even well-constructed, well-intentioned actions by the educational community alone cannot be effective; for most of the major problems facing secondary education have their roots in social and economic issues, the mode of financial support for schools, and the practice of allowing politicians to develop policies that determine how teachers will be educated at the pre-service and inservice levels. Many difficulties in the secondary schools are caused by unpredictable political gyrations at the national level that result in a continual shifting of emphases or directions by the leadership of the United States Office of Education; regardless of the consequences for disciplines, innovation has been the rule for too many years. And this gyration process is continuing today. Financial support for this year's official fad in education, without allowing time to comprehend what the fad really is, continues to be the standard practice. Bandwagoning is a well understood word in education circles. Its implications are all too clear to anyone who within the past twenty years has dealt with problems associated with education at any level. The system of checks and balances, usually found in other aspects of

government, is not as discernible in developments at the Department of Health Education and Welfare's Office of Education.

If the reform movement is to pay off in terms of more effective education for our young adults, appropriate educational reform must occur throughout most of society, from the very top right into each and every secondary school activity. And the directions and emphases of reform must remain stable for some reasonable period of time if positive results are to materialize. For without doubt the unstable, chaotic nature of the recent "reform-innovation movement" itself is one major cause of decay in our schools.

Criticism of the Rationale of the Report

One segment of the Report that has received little attention throughout this volume is the first chapter, "Rationale for New Examination of Secondary Education." I take strong exception to several of the assumptions presented in this chapter. Too many of them are not accurate; and this inaccuracy may give readers of the Report reason to suspect the validity of the recommendations. Recall that the Report defends the Commission's very existence on the grounds that "the wave of criticism against the high school has reached the point of overkill" (p. 3). It is doubtful, however, that criticism will ever stop; the very nature of public-mass education brings it under continual attack. Our concern should be to find ways to distinguish between legitimate criticism that requires action and criticism that is invalid and should be discredited. The Report appears to have accepted as "gospel" most if not all criticisms heard today; the recommendations for reform seem designed to answer every kind of criticism. Ironically, the Report seeks innovation in the guise of reform while at the same time asserting that innovations have little or no lasting effect. The Report cites a statement from Ford Foundation analysts that "most [educational] innovations have been abandoned after the departure of the charismatic promoter or with the reduction of external funding" (p. 7).

The Report states that within the past ten years the cost of high schools to the taxpayers has doubled. It is doubtful that doubling of the cost of secondary education is a unique cause for alarm, since inflation has also doubled the cost of maintaining the status quo in society as a whole within the same period. Many of the proposed recommendations, if implemented would certainly cost additional money above and beyond inflation. Instead of pointing to the need for schools to do more with less money, the Report would have been more helpful if it had discussed the difficulties of developing new ways of obtaining increases in funds to support its own most important recommendations.

The Report does not deal with one of the most significant findings in recent years. The mass of educational research and the experiences of those who have worked in alternative schools indicate that *the overwhelming cause for failure in schools at all levels is interpersonal*: the nature of the relationship that exists between pupil and teacher, teacher and principal, principal and upper administrator, and teacher and specialists such as school phychologists, reading specialists, counselors, and others. How often have we read that the teacher variable is the most significant factor in promoting differences in student attitude, differences in achievement test scores, and improvement in reading and other skills? How students and school personnel deal with and relate to one another in the school setting is crucial to the success or the failure of each and every young adult.

The Report does consider problems developing from the early 1960s associated with society's insistence on sudden traumatic changes in the school's mission. But the Report asserts that professional educators have been mainly responsible for the development of national goals, "contributing to the deep division between the education establishment and the general public" (p. 11). I doubt that this is a true or a fair statement. For example, the Congressional legislation creating the National Science Foundation, the one organization initially responsible for "traumatic changes" of the 1960s, indicates that the prime objective was to update the content of the science curriculum in school programs. The legislation that developed the National Science Foundation and the updating in curricula that followed was almost exclusively in the hands of scientists; few experienced secondary school teachers were involved.[2] Similarly, the Woods Hole Conference of 1959 that catalyzed the "new" emphasis on discovery and inquiry teaching was a meeting of high level scientists and psychologists and other non-members of the so-called educational establishment.[3] James Conant, who probably was the greatest single influence on secondary education during the 1960s was by training an organic chemist.[4] It is safe to say that any trauma faced by the secondary schools during the 1960s was caused by educator and non-educator alike, among many other causes. Another false assumption stated in the Report is that "Teachers who have been prepared to teach middle-class children prove inadequate when faced with children whose achievement is below average." It says further: "This is a major reason why programs for low income, low-achieving children have failed" (p. 12). Experience does not support this conclusion. Successes and failures in public education have occurred quite unrelated to differences in socio-economic background between teacher and pupil. The data shows that some teachers from lower and middle income backgrounds fail miserably with children from all socio-economic levels while others succeed. The opposite can be true also.

The Commission could have enhanced its contribution by considering in detail the difficult problems we face in attracting screening, and preparing humane, concerned, dedicated people to teach in our secondary schools, and the problems society faces in keeping in our schools the high quality teachers that come from all socio-economic levels. Nowhere in the Report do we find recommendations related to prestige for quality teachers, rewards for excellence, flexibility of choice of teachers by students related to cognitive style, and the use of psychological tests designed to predict success as a teacher. These considerations are directly related to interpersonal relations within the schools.

Recommended Actions

One means of responding more constructively to **The Report on the Reform of Secondary Education** is to present, in concise form, several recommendations that may be crucial to the survival of secondary education in the United States. Moreover, effective means to implement them must be presented if they are to be viable. This final section attempts to do both under six subsections: 1. *Recommendations to the Kettering Foundation*; 2. *Financial Structure of Public Education*; 3. *Defining Political Roles*; 4. *Reexamination of State Regulations*; 5. *Federal Distribution of Findings*; 6. *Role of Educational Foundations*.

1. *Recommendations to the Kettering Foundation*:

a. The Kettering Foundation should support a task force that would scrutinize the Commission's recommendations, along with recommendations made in this volume, to determine their validity and priority. This task force should have the responsibility of recasting all accepted recommendations into effective policy statements. These statements should include discussion of societal factors that must be changed to enable the policy to produce the desired outcomes.

b. This task force report must show that the policies are based upon currect assumptions; that is, accurate backup data must support each policy.

c. The policies must recognize that the educational process is first an art, but an art that draws upon scientific procedures and findings for support and improvement.

d. Policies of recruitment, screening, and retention of teachers and administrators for the secondary level must be given a very high priority. Also the nature and extent of the "work load" of teachers must be considered.

e. In addition, policy statements calculated to increase flexibility within schools must be developed—not rigid approaches to flexibility, but ways of fostering creativity among teachers and administrators.

2. *Financial Structure of Public Education*. The entire legal structure of financing public education must be reexamined. The specific questions of financing secondary education and secondary *teacher* education during the next 25 years must be considered in great detail. A task force including educators, business executives, and teachers, appointed by the Secretary of Health Education and Welfare, should be assigned to develop a more flexible system of school finance.

3. *Defining Political Roles*. Means of reducing the effect of national and local politics on secondary education and education in general should be prepared. A new non-politically oriented system of policies clearly defining the role of the U.S. Office of Education and its administration should be developed by a task force appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This task force should include members of both political parties and involve secondary level teachers, educators, government specialists, and people from state and local public school administrations.

4. *Reexamination of State Regulations*. The Commissioner of Education should appoint a national commission assigned the task of finding ways to change state regulations in order to attract and retain quality teachers, and to remove from the profession those that do not meet the standards as defined by this commission. The abundant literature on qualities of teachers should be made available to this group. This commission should consist of teachers known for their excellence and researchers who have dealt with the question of excellence.

5. *Federal Distribution of Findings*. The U.S. Government Printing Office should publish and distribute without charge the recommendations and procedures developed by groups proposed above to every local board of education, regional or intermediate unit, state department of education, dean of a teacher education program, and to every director of an educational foundation.

6. *Role of Educational Foundations.* Foundations and the Office of Education should be asked by the Commissioner of Education to support long-range projects that will help to implement policies that have been developed. The Office of Education should set aside fundsonly for long range projects implementing the proposed policies.

Secondary education in our turbulent society will survive only if we mount this kind of concerted long range effort—and soon.

References

1. James Coleman, et al., **Youth: Transition to Adulthood**, The University of Chicago Press, 1974.
2. **1970 National Science Foundation Authorization Hearings Before the Subcommittee On Science Research and Development**, U. S. House of Representatives (H. R. 4283), Volumes 1 and 2.
3. Jerome Bruner, **The Process of Education**, Harvard University Press, 1960, and Vintage Books, 1963.
4. James Bryant Conant, **The American High School Today**, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.
5. For a summary of the major Commission Report on Secondary Education see the May 1975 issue of *Kappan*, "Reforming America's High Schools," by Harry Passow.